



Planning Committee Date	4 th September 2024 Cambridge City Council Planning Committee
Lead Officer	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
Reference	24/01244/FUL
Site	Anstey Hall, Maris Lane
Ward / Parish	Trumpington
Proposal	Construction of two blocks of retirement accommodation (Class C2) comprising 87 two-bedroom apartments with associated hard and soft landscaping, bin storage, cycle and car parking. Provision of new vehicular access onto Maris Lane and reconfiguration of wall with new entrance gates. New pedestrian access onto Old Mills Road.
Applicant	Trumpington Investments Ltd (Mr John De Bruyne)
Presenting Officer	Tom Gray
Reason Reported to Committee	Third party representations in support and in opposition
Member Site Visit Date	-
Key Issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Principle of development2. Impact upon the character/loss of protected open space3. Impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and setting of the Listed Building4. Other Matters
Recommendation	REFUSE

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The application proposes the construction of two blocks of retirement accommodation to the south of Anstey Hall. New pedestrian accesses to allow public access to the protected open space are proposed in addition to hard and soft landscaping, cycle and car parking and bin storage. In addition, the proposal is for a new vehicular access onto Maris Lane and reconfiguration of the wall with new entrance gates.
- 1.2 Following planning committee's refusal of the last application, it was members' expectations that improvements were made to address officers' concerns. The new scheme has not been subject to the pre-application process and does not offer some of the benefits of the previous proposal. Whilst the proposal addresses some of the minor technical reasons for refusal, in terms of the blocks located within the grounds of Anstey Hall, it is still substantially the same.
- 1.3 The existing application site comprises a Grade II* Listed Building, located within the Trumpington Conservation Area and adjacent to the Cambridge Green Belt. The site is protected open space for its environmental and recreational qualities. It is located to the north and east of the Trumpington Meadows residential development.
- 1.4 There is mature planting within the site with statutory protected trees along the site's eastern boundaries, and the site is located in close proximity to a City Wildlife Site. The site is subject to an area of high surface water flooding.
- 1.5 Whilst the proposal would provide private retirement accommodation for an ageing population, the proposed retirement blocks would consume a substantial portion of protected open space which would not be satisfactorily replaced in terms of quantity elsewhere. Moreover, the open character of this park and garden and setting of this Listed Building (Anstey Hall) would be significantly eroded and the setting of the city would be adversely impacted.
- 1.6 The proposed retirement blocks would fail to appropriately relate to the Anstey Hall in terms of their design, siting and scale and therefore have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of Trumpington Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building. The harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to the setting and significance of Anstey Hall is identified as a high-level of 'less than substantial' harm and it is not considered that the public benefits arising from the scheme would outweigh this identified harm.
- 1.7 Whilst the proposed car parking is sufficient and traffic movements are considered acceptable, the application fails to provide convenient and integrated cycle provision for future occupiers, visitors and employees, whilst insufficient archaeological information has been submitted.

- 1.8 Moreover, the plans and documents submitted with the application are insufficient and do not reflect accurately the proposed development.
- 1.9 Other potential impacts such as amenity impacts, biodiversity, trees, refuse provision, flood risk and renewable energy have been considered as part of this planning assessment.
- 1.10 Officers recommend that the Planning Committee refuse the application.

1.11 Site Description and Context

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

- 1.12 The application site comprises a Grade II* Building of Anstey Hall, a 17th Century Country House, and Historic Park and Garden. During the application process, the Hall was downgraded from Grade I. The site is Protected Open Space for both its environmental and recreational qualities.
- 1.13 The site is located approximately 4km west of Cambridge City Centre. Anstey Hall is located within the Trumpington Conservation Area and is adjacent to the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary and St Michael and its associated Grade II Listed Vicarage. To the northeast of Anstey Hall are several curtilage Listed outbuildings that have largely been converted to businesses with the exception of the garaging and the Grade II Listed Lodge and Gate Piers, in addition to the Grade II Listed Building of Maris House.
- 1.14 The site is located to the south and Maris Lane, to the north/east of the Trumpington Meadows residential development (an area of major change) and Anstey Hall Barns and west of Waitrose supermarket and car park. There is mature tree planting, in particular on the western and eastern boundaries. The trees on the eastern boundaries in which have statutory protection (TPOs).
- 1.15 Trumpington Meadows Country Park, part of the Cambridge Green Belt is located further to the west whilst the application site is situated adjacent to the protected open space of Trumpington Church Cemetery, a public space. Grantchester Road Plantations is located 100 metres further to the northwest, which is designated as a City Wildlife Site.

- 1.16 The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 (lowest fluvial flood risk), however, 1 in 30-year (high) surface water flood risk, 1 in 100 year (medium) surface water flood risk and 1 in 1000 year (low) surface water flood risk exists within the application site.
- 1.17 Vehicular access to the site is achieved from Maris Lane. Uncontrolled parking exists on adjacent streets.
- 1.18 A listed building consent application has been submitted for the reconfiguration of wall to restore historic access onto Maris Lane. The impact upon the listed building is assessed under listed building consent application 24/01245/LBC.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The proposed development would consist of two 3 storey accommodation blocks, containing a total of 87 retirement (C2 use) units, each of which would contain 2 bedrooms.
- 2.2 The proposed development would comprise the creation of a vehicular access onto Maris Lane, reconfiguration of the wall, hard and soft landscaping, cycle and car parking, bin storage, and pedestrian access onto Old Mills Road. A public park would be created to the south of the Hall within the grassed open space, which would be connected to the Trumpington Meadows residential development beyond, through a stone belvedere flanked by two flights of stone steps.

3.0 Relevant Site History

Reference	Description	Outcome
21/02332/FUL & 21/02333/LBC	Change of use of Anstey Hall from a wedding venue Use Class formerly D2 (now sui generis) with associated guest accommodation (Use Class C1) which is now collectively sui generis, to use as student accommodation (Use Class C2) for Sixth Form students taught at Dukes Education's St Andrews College, Cambridge	Withdrawn Refused
21/01696/FUL	Change of use of Anstey Hall from Wedding Venue (D2, now F2) and Hotel (C1) to Residential Institution (C2) with ancillary visitor accommodation	Refused
20/01426/FUL	Construction of two blocks of retirement accommodation (Class C2) comprising 87 two-bedroom	

	apartments. Change of use of land to public open space. Change of use of Anstey Hall to mixed uses including ancillary use on the lower ground, ground and first floor to serve the residential retirement community, 5x staff accommodation on the second floor, a C3 private flatted dwelling on the second floor, and 7x short -term guest accommodation on the ground and first floor. Demolition of greenhouses and flat-roof building and erection of Orangery to house an ancillary restaurant and swimming pool connected to the hall by an existing link, provision of pedestrian access onto Maris Lane and reconfiguration of wall, hard and soft landscaping, car parking and pedestrian access onto Old Mills Road	Refused
20/01427/LBC	Demolition of greenhouses and flat-roof building and erection of Orangery to house an ancillary restaurant and swimming pool connected to the hall by an existing link. Reconfiguration of wall to restore historic access onto Maris Lane.	Advice Given
19/5091/PREAPP	87 retirement apartments, new orangery containing catering and support services, use of Anstey Hall as central facilities and new vehicular and pedestrian accesses.	Permitted
18/1537/FUL & 18/1538/LBC	Convert existing store rooms into bedrooms with ensuite on ground and first floor loft space, including a roof extension with dormer window on the south elevation. Two new conservation rooflights and internal chimney removed.	Permitted
16/0586/FUL	Installation of a new pedestrian link between Waitrose Store and Barratt development and associated works.	Permitted
15/0871/LBC		

15/0101/ADV	Form new door opening within bookshelves of the west wall of the library. Install "art nouveau" stained glass screen in passage.	Permitted
14/0159/FUL & 14/0160/LBC	External Seating Banners & Stainless Steel Posts	Permitted
13/0950/FUL	Demolition of modern barn and outbuildings and removal of temporary structures to allow conversion of barns, cart sheds and stables to eight residential units and erection of four dwellings, the creation of a spur access drive from Anstey Hall Drive and associated works.	Permitted
12/0504/FUL	Extension to front of store building (Use Class A1) and associated works and improvements.	Permitted
12/0456/FUL	Retrospective change of use from B1 (offices) to (D2) wedding venue and associated (C1) hotel and guest use for 12 bedrooms.	Permitted
10/0180/FUL & 10/0181/LBC	Request permission to continue use of Marquee for Wedding ceremonies etc for a period of at least 3 years.	Refused, Appeal Dismissed
08/0631/FUL & 08/0708/LBC	Formation of extended vehicular driveway and new opening in boundary wall.	Permitted
07/1335/FUL	Refurbishment and change of use of storage and greenhouse to office/light industrial.	Permitted
07/1354/LBC	Change of use of redundant carriage house to offices.	Permitted
07/1092/LBC	New south elevation wall and windows, replacement of floors, partitions and roof.	Permitted
07/1094/FUL	Form an opening of 6 metres wide with two new brick pillars constructed from the reclaimed bricks, stone plinths and two reclaimed stone balls.	Permitted

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

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

3.2 The most recent application for retirement accommodation in the grounds of Anstey Hall was refused under application 20/01426/FUL for several reasons as follows:

1. Loss of and impact upon protected open space.
2. Loss of trees and open character of the site. Design, siting and scale of the proposed blocks and design of the Orangery resulting in harm to the Conservation Area and setting of the Listed Building.
3. Insufficient information provided for the reconfiguration of the Maris Lane wall.
4. Lack of facilities for the storage of cycles and mobility vehicles.
5. Lack of sequential test for the siting of the block within a high surface water risk area.
6. Insufficient information with regards an energy and overheating strategy.
7. Lighting impacts upon bat species.
8. Noise impacts upon future occupiers.
9. Insufficient information with regards a refuse strategy and swept path analysis.
10. Insufficient archaeological information to demonstrate that the principle is acceptable.

3.3 During the course of the current application, it was agreed with the applicant that on the basis of amended information already provided in Spring 2024 including ecology and drainage information that required formal re-consultation, this information was accepted. Due to timescales of committee reporting to ensure the timeliness of decision making, whilst outlining officers' concerns with the applicant, no further information which has required formal re-consultation has been accepted.

4.0 Policy

4.1 National

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide 2019

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

Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)

Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (2015)

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

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Environment Act 2023

ODPM Circular 06/2005 – Protected Species

Equalities Act 2010

4.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

Policy 1: The presumption in favour of sustainable development

Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development

Policy 8: Setting of the city

Policy 18: Southern fringe areas of major change

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

Policy 29: Renewable and low carbon energy generation

Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle

Policy 32: Flood risk

Policy 33: Contaminated land

Policy 34: Light pollution control

Policy 35: Human health and quality of life

Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust

Policy 45: Affordable housing and dwelling mix

Policy 47: Specialist housing

Policy 50: Residential space standards

Policy 51: Accessible Homes

Policy 55: Responding to context

Policy 56: Creating successful places

Policy 57: Designing new buildings

Policy 59: Designing landscape and the public realm

Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of historic environment

Policy 62: Local heritage assets

Policy 67: Protection of open space

Policy 70: Protection of priority species and habitats

Policy 71: Trees

Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development

Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development

Policy 82: Parking management

Policy 85: Infrastructure delivery, planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy

4.3 Supplementary Planning Documents

Biodiversity SPD – Adopted February 2022

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – Adopted January 2020

Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD – Adopted November 2016

Health Impact Assessment SPD – Adopted March 2011

Landscape in New Developments SPD – Adopted March 2010

Open Space SPD – Adopted January 2009
Public Art SPD – Adopted January 2009
Trees and Development Sites SPD – Adopted January 2009
Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011

4.4 Other Guidance

Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal 2010

5.0 Consultations

5.1 Access Officer – No objection.

5.2 Anglian Water – No comments received.

5.3 Cambridge and Peterborough Integrated Care System – Seeks developer contribution.

5.4 Conservation Officer – Objection.

5.5 Compared to the previous proposal, the new Maris Lane access is now vehicular. Change of use of Anstey Hall to mixed uses no longer proposed. The demolition of the greenhouses and flat-roof building, and erection of the Orangery is no longer proposed.

5.6 No proposed change of use to the hall, however, there is reference to the hall being used to provide central facilities in the submitted material. Reference to the new development providing funding for repairs, but no positive mechanism to secure this. Detracts from the claimed public benefits and so weakens the case for the proposed development. Flat roofed building to remain is also a negative in terms of heritage.

5.7 The impact of the two proposed large, residential blocks remains the main physical consideration. Their external form and appearance is neither contextual with the house or its estate building nor an elegant contemporary addition. Neither, in their extent and footprint can the blocks be said to be subservient to Anstey Hall.

5.8 Central vista would be framed by the new blocks and so would be completely alien character. New blocks would be unrelated to the Hall in terms of design, location and scale.

5.9 Degree of less than substantial harm to the setting of the Hall and the conservation area is attributed a greater level of harm due mainly to the design of the apartment blocks.

5.10 Removing the detrimental, flat roofed dining building is no longer proposed. Belvedere would introduce a new view.

- 5.11 Degree of public access already through the existing use. The increase in public access would be compromised by the large residential blocks.
- 5.12 No objection to gates and walls to Maris Lane subject to a condition requiring materials to be brick and natural stone.
- 5.13 In conclusion, the benefits that the scheme would deliver are undermined by the extensive residential blocks within the grounds. Their design/appearance does not weigh in the scheme's favour.
- 5.14 Optimum viable use needs to be consistent with the conservation of the heritage asset and given the impact of the apartment blocks on the Hall's setting, it cannot be considered optimum.
- 5.15 Officers have not suggested that the Hall or outbuildings are in serious need of repair nor that the owner was required to bring forward development to pay for such. There is no suggestion that the heritage assets are at risk or needs enabling development.
- 5.16 Repairs stated may need Listed Building Consent (not sought as part of this application). The DAS states that this has not been set out specifically as a case for enabling development (development to enable the repair of a historic building), however, elsewhere it states that the capital generated will fund the maintenance of the hall and parkland garden.
- 5.17 DAS still shows the now excluded conservatory/dining hall. High level of less than substantial harm. It has not been demonstrated that the proposals secure the optimum viable use of the asset, consistent with its conservation. No mechanism (a legal agreement) has been proposed to ensure that the funds generated by the scheme are channelled into securing future repair and maintenance of the Listed Buildings.
- 5.18 If committee are minded to approve, suggest conditions requiring advanced landscaping, approval of materials for the wall/gates and mechanism to secure funds for the repair/maintenance of the buildings.
- 5.19 County Adult Social Care – No comments received.**
- 5.20 County Archaeology – Objection. Additional information required.**
- 5.21 Geophysical survey has been submitted. Recommend site is subject to an archaeological evaluation for the fuller consideration of the presence/absence, nature, extent, quality and survival of archaeological remains within the proposed development area. An informed judgement can then be made as to the suitability of the development in this location etc.
- 5.22 County Highways Development Management – No objection**

- 5.23 Recommends traffic management plan, falls and levels, bound material conditions. Informative.
- 5.24 Concerns over pedestrian and cycle permeability through the site. Recommend provision of dedicated footways/cycleways through the site that is separate from motor vehicle traffic. Will seek provision of a footway link on Maris Lane, from the eastern access to the existing footway on the southwestern side of Maris Lane. Pedestrian access onto Old Mills Lane crosses third party land which will require permission of the landowner.
- 5.25 County Transport Team – No objection.**
- 5.26 Parking is acceptable. Proposed development is expected to generate less trips than the existing use.
- 5.27 Designing Out Crime Officer – No objection subject to condition.**
- 5.28 East of England Ambulance Service – Developer contribution will be required.**
- 5.29 Environment Agency – No comments received.**
- 5.30 Fire Authority – No objection subject to provision of fire hydrants required.**
- 5.31 Environmental Health – No objection subject to conditions.**
- 5.32 Recommends noise impact assessment for the proposed plant sources, hours of use for the public park, EV charging point provision, artificial lighting, contamination and remediation strategy, construction noise/vibration and dust control, and construction hours.
- 5.33 Noise impacts from Waitrose site will be low/negligible. Consideration to restricting hours of use of the public open space to protecting residents in the late evening and night-time and perhaps with stricter hours for Sunday mornings and evenings.
- 5.34** Noise impacts from ASHPs can be dealt with via condition.
- 5.35 Historic England – Objection.**
- 5.36 High level of less than substantial harm.
- 5.37 The proximity of these large residential blocks would compromise the appreciation of the Hall in what survives of its open setting.
- 5.38 Landscaping benefits would be wholly undermined by the presence of the large scale residential blocks within the grounds, with the result that they would not succeed in mitigating against their impact.

- 5.39 Discrepancy between submitted documents regarding the level of less than substantial harm is noted.
- 5.40 Anstey Hall is one of only 5.8% of Listed Buildings that are listed as Grade II*.
- 5.41 Do not consider it would be appropriate to treat the Hall as a town house, and we emphasise the importance of retaining the surviving garden setting. The remaining land in the ownership of Anstey hall makes a strong contribution to the setting and significance of the Hall and it is important that this is not further compromised by additional development.
- 5.42 Positive elements of the scheme are landscaping proposals and connectivity. Refurbishments proposed are welcomed however no details of these.
- 5.43 Not been demonstrated that providing central facilities for the proposed retirement community would constitute the optimum viable use of the Grade II* Listed Anstey Hall, consistent with its conservation.
- 5.44 Landscape Officer – Objection.**
- 5.45 Loss of protected open space. Site provides a visual amenity from public areas within Trumpington Meadows and elsewhere. Link between the parkland of the site and the adjacent residential development which continues the vista between the listed house and the large apartment building.
- 5.46 Existing protected open space falls within the Environmental Importance category and an important element in the character of the local area.
- 5.47 No form of assessment provided to demonstrate that the land within the blue line land is acceptable or that the compensation is aspect including size, access, character and biodiversity or public benefit.
- 5.48 Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection subject to conditions.**
- 5.49 Surface water from the proposed development can be managed through the use of permeable paving over access and parking areas.
- 5.50 Recommends surface water drainage scheme, avoidance of surface water through construction phase, confirmation of constructed SuDS and groundwater monitoring.
- 5.51 Previous comments (24th April 2024): Objection.
- 5.52 Nature Conservation Officer – No objection subject to conditions**
- 5.53 Biodiversity net gain and increased buffer between blocks and habitats are supported. Retention of these features reduces the likely impact on

- foraging bats and therefore previously requested bat survey information no longer required. Request ecologically sensitive lighting scheme, construction ecological management plan, biodiversity net gain details and biodiversity enhancements.
- 5.54 Previous comments (18th July 2024) Potential errors with the metric which require clarification. Negative impacts during construction and operational phases of the proposal.
- 5.55 Previous comments (12th June 2024): Concern regarding biodiversity net gain habitat classification query and additional bat foraging survey requirement.
- 5.56 Shared Waste Team Officer – No objection subject to condition.**
- 5.57 S106 Monitoring Officer – No objection. No financial contributions are required.**
- 5.58 Sustainability Officer – Additional information required.**
- 5.59 Of the 87 proposed units, 12 are single aspect units, with 6 of these having a west facing elevation, which could make them more prone to overheating. Some shading is provided through reveals and balconies, however, it would be helpful to understand whether the design of the units has been tested against requirements of Part O of Building Regulations. Recommend that the single aspect units be tested using the Dynamic thermal modelling route and additional windows added to create dual aspect units which will enhance ventilation.
- 5.60 Energy statement and carbon calculations which suggest a 69.9% improvement on the Part L 2021 compliant baseline, with air source heat pumps is welcomed. Further information for ASHPs requested to ensure there is sufficient space. Recommend submission of revised SAP calculations secured via condition.
- 5.61 Water efficiency of 99.9 litres/person/day is proposed which is welcomed and can be conditioned.
- 5.62 Tree Officer – No objection.**
- 5.63 Current proposal increases the distance between construction and trees and allows for the retention of more trees than the previous scheme.
- 5.64 Recommend arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan, site meeting, implementation of tree protection and replacement tree planting.
- 5.65 Urban Design Officer – Objection**
- 5.66 Loss of existing open space, harm to the character of the site, concerns about the layout, scale and massing which fail to respond positively to the

key qualities of the site's context, as well as concerns in relation to functional design of the scheme.

- 5.67 Changes to positioning of the buildings are negligible. Significant reduction to the open character of the park and garden. Loss of 8 significant trees identified within the Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal.
- 5.68 Scale, massing and appearance of the buildings do not respond positively.
- 5.69 Cycle parking stores approach appears an afterthought. The large, shared stores are poorly located to the main entrances of the blocks. Concerns regards shallow balconies and poor thresholds to car parking remain. Unclear how the homes could be adapted in the future.
- 5.70 Poorly designed scheme that fails to address the fundamental concerns relating to layout, scale and massing, with the changes considered minor and negligible. Fails to respond to the key qualities of the site's context and will harm the overall character of the site.

6.0 Third Party Representations

- 6.1 Representations from 18 addresses have been received (10 in objection, 8 in support)
- 6.2 Those in objection have raised the following issues:

Highway safety impacts and parking

- Concerns regarding construction traffic and waste collection. Anstey Hall Barns access road has not been built to the standard required.
- Requests that eastern access be used for construction, waste and delivery vehicles instead and also asks whether this could be the only one used for residents/visitors.
- Lack of pedestrian and vehicle visibility at night along Anstey Barns access road, and due to bend and gateposts.
- Increase in the volume of traffic on Anstey Hall Barns access road and along Maris Lane which is congested at peak times.
- Transport statement is out of date.
- Parking is insufficient. Parking pressure on surrounding streets.

Scale/siting, impact upon Anstey Hall and neighbouring amenities

- Three storey blocks not compatible with the area, too high and overbearing.
- Too intrusive on the setting of Anstey Hall and surrounding homes.
- Accommodation block too close to Piper Road.
- Positioning of western access road too close to Piper Road and suggest repositioning on the other side of the trees.
- Anstey Hall gardens would be destroyed.
- Developer already generated sums through Anstey Hall development but no significant improvements to the Hall have been

made. Recommends conditions to ensure renovation and that any future owner is bound by conditions.

- Risk of damage to neighbouring wall.

Open space

- No details of are marked hatched blue are provided.
- Blue hatched area should be protected for the future due to wildlife habitat.
- Questions access to blue hatched area.
- Lack of details on security provisions and strategy.
- Security concerns with public access to Anstey Hall Barns access road
- Questions whether there is a proposed pedestrian access onto Piper Road.

Tree impacts

- North-western woodland has been excluded from the drawing which is misleading.
- Loss of trees along Piper Road to facilitate access.
- Asks for arboricultural information to be conditioned.
- Risk of damage to neighbouring trees during construction.

Environmental/amenity impacts

- Noise and light pollution.
- Air pollution from increased traffic.
- Anti-social behaviour.

6.3 Those in support have raised cited the following reasons

- Great benefit and asset to the community.
- Allow use by local organisations and charities.
- Aesthetically pleasing and thoughtful.
- Valuable contribution to ageing population.
- Good location.
- Generosity of the applicant.
- Planning obligation money should be made to onsite clinic.

7.0 Member Representations

7.1 None received.

8.0 Local Groups / Petitions

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

- Significant harm by virtue of its scale and massing.
- Unconvinced by parallels drawn with residential squares in major cities.
- Setting on the edge of the city.
- Suggest several smaller blocks and reduction of units.

- Substantial activity generated on and off site from carers, visitors and deliveries.
- Loss of trees through removal of 19 trees.
- Does not preserve or enhance the significance of the conservation area or the Grade II* Listed Hall.
- New blocks would be constructed on greenspace without any corresponding mitigation or public benefit.
- Clarity regarding Orangery, listing grade and whether building would serve community need to be clarified.
- More information required regarding public access to any facilities within the Hall.
- Safeguarding issues arise which would necessitate closure of park at night.
- Open characteristic of the area will be lost through the development of the blocks.
- Water feature will block views of the Hall itself.
- Western access is unsatisfactory as it would see increased volumes of traffic.
- Concerns with impacts of ASHPs on Conservation Area and setting of Listed Building. Suggest use of ground source heat pumps.
- Solar gain needs to be taken into account.

8.2 Trumpington Local History Group comments as follows:

- Considerable archaeological interest which should be assessed prior to development work. Ask for planning condition.

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

9.0 Assessment

10.0 Background

10.1 The previous application, 20/01426/FUL was refused by planning committee in line with officers' recommendation.

10.2 Whilst officers encouraged that the applicant to enter into pre-application discussions, the new scheme has not been subject to the pre-application process.

10.3 The proposed scheme further narrows the protected open space, whilst it does not offer some of the benefits of the previous scheme in terms of the offer of a swimming pool within the orangery, the change of use of Anstey Hall itself nor the demolition of flat-roofed building which currently detract from the heritage assets.

10.4 The proposed scheme within the grounds of Anstey Hall is substantially the same as the previously refused scheme and has not been subject to improvements to the proposed blocks' relationship to Anstey Hall. Whilst

attempts have been made to overcome some of the technical reasons for refusal, the scheme is substantially the same proposal as previously before members. Members should therefore approach their assessment of the application with this background information in mind

10.5 Principle of Development – Spatial Strategy

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

10.7 Policy 8 of the Local Plan 2018 states that:

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

- a. responds to, conserves and enhances the setting, and special character of the city, in accordance with the Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment 2003, Green Belt assessments, Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and their successor documents;
- b. promotes access to the surrounding countryside/open space, where appropriate; and
- c. safeguards the best and most versatile agricultural land unless sustainable development considerations and the need for development are sufficient to override the need to protect the agricultural value of land; and
- d. includes landscape improvement proposals that strengthen or re-create the well-defined and vegetated urban edge, improve visual amenity and enhance biodiversity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

10.11 Although it is recognised that its wider setting has changed somewhat over the years, the application site itself remains adjacent to Green Belt land and protected open space to the northwest along which mature trees penetrate its boundaries and are key feature from the which along with its open landscape provides a degree of biodiversity interest. The application site's environmental qualities are recognised in the site's designation as a Protected Open Space. Whilst the applicant contends that the site is no longer on the urban edge, it is clear that on the basis of Policy 8 and the supporting text and taking into account the site constraints and open landscapes, this policy would directly apply to this development proposal.

10.12 With regards criterion a of Policy 8, this is discussed in detail within the subsequent design section of this planning assessment and concerns the impact of the development upon the setting and special character of the city. In this regard, it is considered that the proposed development would have an adverse impact.

10.13 With regards criterion b of Policy 8, the application proposes to make the Hall's private grounds publicly accessible. A new pedestrian gate is proposed to the south to connect with the Trumpington Meadows residential development. A pedestrian gate is also proposed to connect with the Waitrose car park to the east. Whilst there is limited direct pedestrian access to either Maris Lane or Piper Road, as whole the proposed development would meet the criteria within Policy 8(b) of the Local Plan 2018.

10.14 The existing land use is an historic park and garden and therefore it is not considered that the proposal would result in a loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land and therefore there is no conflict with Policy 8(c) of the Local Plan 2018.

10.15 Notwithstanding the presence and visual impact of the proposed residential blocks, the proposed development would provide some landscape improvements in terms of the reinstatement of Anstey Hall's

pleasure gardens and ha-ha which could potentially improve the visual amenity of the space for the public. The current proposal increases the distance between construction and trees which allows the retention of more trees than the previous scheme, thus ensuring the vegetated urban edge is retained.

10.16 Notwithstanding this, by virtue of the adverse impact upon the setting and special character of the city, the principle of this development on the edge of the city and within the Protected Open Space is contrary to Policy 8 of the Local Plan 2018.

10.17 Principle of Development – Flood Risk

10.18 The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding); however, residential Block B would be located within a 1 in 30 year event (high risk) of surface water flood risk.

10.19 Paragraph 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023 states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

10.20 Paragraph 168 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023 states that the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. The sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding.

10.21 The application is accompanied by a flood risk and drainage assessment which states that whilst the site is subject to overland surface water flooding with the provision of adequate mitigation and resistance measures the risks can be reduced and considered low within the development design. Furthermore, justification has been provided on the sequential test, which demonstrates that only a small portion of the site would be subject to surface water risk whilst it is considered in the flood risk terms, taking a pragmatic approach, it is not considered that there are preferable alternative sites.

10.22 It is therefore considered that on balance, officers consider that the proposed development would pass the sequential test as set out in paragraph 165 of the NPPF 2023.

10.23 Officers therefore consider that the principle of development in flood risk terms accords with Policy 32 of the Local Plan 2018 and paragraphs 165-

175 of the NPPF 2023. This is discussed further in the water management and flood risk section of this report.

10.24 Principle of Development – Protected Open Space

10.25 Policy 67 of the Local Plan 2018 states that:

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

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

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

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

10.27 Furthermore, its recreational attributes warranting its protection includes its size, quality and accessibility.

10.28 The proposed development would consist of two 3 storey residential blocks and associated car parking, cycle and refuse storage within the historic park and garden of Anstey Hall. Therefore, on this basis, the proposed development would result in a loss of protected open space.

10.29 Supporting text to Policy 67 at paragraph 7.47 states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. However, there may be circumstances where development proposals can enhance the character, use and visual amenity of open space, and provide ancillary recreational facilities, such as changing facilities, or materially improve the recreational or biodiversity value of the site.

- 10.30 The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) states that the site at present is not used for recreation nor is it covered by any ecological designations. The applicant's submission also argues that many views do not extend beyond the vegetation on the site boundary whilst it would increase public access to the site.
- 10.31 Whilst increasing public access to the site is welcomed and would be beneficial, it is considered that the existing site already has recreational value as the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011 attests. Nevertheless, in this instance, the development proposals are considered to increase the use of the site to the wider public outside of the existing use as a hotel and wedding venue.
- 10.32 As Policy 67 states, there is a presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Elsewhere with the Local Plan, within Appendix D which refers to the Southern Fringe Development Area (Policy 18), it is noted that one of the key development principles of Trumpington Meadows development is to maximise opportunities for views of Anstey Hall and garden from the public realm, while protecting and enhancing its setting.
- 10.33 In this instance, as third parties/local groups note, the proposed development would encroach upon a substantial portion of this protected open space. Moreover, the character of this protected open space including the setting of Anstey Hall would be severely impacted through the siting of the residential blocks which would be highly visible particularly from the south and west. The proposed development therefore would undermine the approach taken with the adjacent Trumpington Meadows development.
- 10.34 The applicant claims that the existing open space would be more publicly accessible by providing multiple pedestrian access points. Some details of opening times have been submitted which would restrict the public from accessing the public open space during night-time hours. This is to ensure that lighting is minimised and the potential for anti-social behaviour within the vicinity reduced. Notwithstanding this, this approach would reinforce the opinion that the open space is for private use as it would be more restricted than other public parks within the city and therefore only limited weight to the provision of this space for the public's use can be afforded.
- 10.35 In addition, the applicant claims that the new planting, water feature and belvedere would increase the quality of this space. Whilst third party/local group comments are noted, some aspects of the landscaping scheme are supported and details could be conditioned on any planning consent granted. However, following a formal consultation with the Council's Landscape Officer, by virtue of the blocks' inappropriate siting, excessive scale and incongruous design, the proposed development would adversely impact the character and visual amenity of the protected open space.

- 10.36 Paragraph 7.48 states that replacement sites/facilities should be no more than a short walk (400m) from the site that is to be replaced unless it can be proved that a more accessible area of open space can be provided. Replacement sites/facilities should not increase any identified deficiencies in open space in the ward where the original site is located. Consideration should also be given to how they link with the wider ecological network and enhance biodiversity.
- 10.37 The applicant claims that the proposal would compensate for the loss of protected open space with an area to the west of the application site, within the applicant's ownership. Third party comments regarding the lack of details are noted. This area is relatively small compared to the area developed for the new residential blocks and therefore the quantity of space would not outweigh the harm to the protected open space through the siting of the new residential blocks.
- 10.38 Taking all this into account, by virtue of the partial loss of protected open space and harm to its character, Officers consider that the principle of development is not supported with reference to Policy 67 of the Local Plan 2018.

10.39 Principle of Development – Specialist Housing Provision

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

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

- 10.41 No comments from the Adult Social Care Team have been received on this application, however, the proposal is for private retirement accommodation with the flexibility to provide private 'extra care' provision and 'assisted living' in which there is no publicly available data on need. Nevertheless, in this instance, there is a considered a general need for retirement accommodation given the ageing population of the area in accordance with criterion (a) of Policy 47.
- 10.42 The proposed development would be purposely designed for occupation by older people and the submitted floor plans detail that these would be

appropriate for the older population in accordance with criterion b of this policy. The submitted Design and Access statement confirms that the retirement blocks meet M4(2 and 3) requirements in such that access to each apartment would be step free. The apartments would be adaptable. The access officer has been consulted on the application and raised no objection to the development and offered suggestions for detailed design stage. On this basis, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 51 of the Local Plan 2018.

- 10.43 Given the location of the application site in relation to a supermarket, services including a doctor's surgery and bus services to the city centre, the proposed development would meet the requirements of criterion (c) of this policy.
- 10.44 The surrounding context is one of predominately mixed residential C3 uses. Taking this into account, the proposed development would not result in an excessive concentration of this housing type in the area in accordance with criterion d of this policy.
- 10.45 Given that the proposed development comprises specialist housing (C2 use), no affordable housing is required to meet the requirements of Policy 45 of the Local Plan 2018 in this instance.
- 10.46 On this basis, Officers consider that the principle of providing retirement accommodation is acceptable in accordance with policy 47 of the Local Plan 2018. The details of such a use could be secured via a S106 obligation attached to any planning consent granted.
- 10.47 Design, Layout, Scale and Landscaping and impact upon the character and appearance of the Trumpington Conservation Area and setting of Listed Buildings**
- 10.48 The application site is located within the Trumpington Conservation Area which is described within the Conservation Area Appraisal as "characterized by the grand manor houses of Trumpington Hall and Anstey Hall and a mixture of smaller buildings of different ages..."
- 10.49 The Appraisal continues by adding that Anstey Hall is set in substantial private grounds... "The gardens and the grounds of Anstey Hall are vital to the setting of the buildings and the character of the Conservation Area as a whole. However, there is no public access to these private grounds."
- 10.50 In addition, the Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal identifies a number of protected and significant features on the site that make up the special character and setting of Anstey Hall. This includes the Grade II* listed Anstey Hall, Walls of Townscape Significance, tree protection order (TPO) areas, individual TPOs, significant tree groups, 8 individual significant trees and a significant viewpoint from the southern boundary of the site looking north towards Anstey Hall.

- 10.51 The setting of the Hall makes an important contribution to its significance. There are panoramic views of the Hall and grounds from the southern end of the application site. Anstey Hall was designed to be seen in a landscape setting with immediate pleasure grounds to the north of the hall, beyond which was a wider largely parkland landscape. Historic England note that the reasons for this listing is its historic interest (a country house of considerable architectural distinction), its architectural interest and its group value with the Grade II listed Lodge which along with the other (unlisted) associated outbuilding, form an important architectural and historic context for the Hall.
- 10.52 Whilst the setting of the Conservation Area has changed to an extent over recent years, nonetheless, following a formal consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer and Historic England, the historical significance of the house and its grounds is based in a village context being a country house rather than that of a town house. Overall, the Hall and grounds make an important and major contribution to the Trumpington Conservation Area.
- 10.53 Indeed, the setting of Anstey Hall and the identified significant view on site was a key consideration in the master planning for the Trumpington Meadows development, which through this adjacent development's site layout, building form and appearance, responded directly to this view and the special character of the historic core of Trumpington Village. This is described in Appendix D of the Local Plan 2018.
- 10.54 The impact of the proposed two residential blocks (Blocks B & C) have been considered in respect of the following policy context and has been subject to formal consultations with the Council's Landscape, Urban Design and Conservation Officers.
- 10.55 Local Plan Policies 55, 56, 57, 58 and 59 seek to ensure that development responds appropriately to its context, is of a high quality, reflects or successfully contrasts with existing building forms and materials and includes appropriate landscaping and boundary treatment.
- 10.56 Policy 55 states that development will be supported where it is demonstrated that it responds positively to its context and has drawn inspiration from the key characteristics of its surroundings to help create distinctive and high-quality places.
- 10.57 Policy 57 states that high quality new buildings will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they (amongst other considerations):
- a. have a positive impact on their setting in terms of location on the site, height, scale and form, materials and detailing, ground floor activity, wider townscape and landscape impacts and available views;
 - b. are convenient, safe and accessible for all users;
 - c. are constructed in a sustainable manner and are easily adaptable;

- d. successfully integrate functional needs such as refuse and recycling, bicycles and car parking;
- 10.58 Supporting text paragraph 7.10 of Policy 57 states that high quality building design is linked to context, in terms of appropriateness, and to place making in terms of how the proposed development will be sited. Without imposing architectural tastes or styles, it is important that a proposed development is considered in terms of site location, height, scale, form, and proportions, along with materials and detailing.
- 10.59 Policy 61 states that to ensure the conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment, proposals should:
- a. preserve or enhance the significance of the heritage assets of the city, their setting and the wider townscape, including views into, within and out of conservation areas;
 - b. retain buildings and spaces, the loss of which would cause harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area;
 - c. be of an appropriate scale, form, height, massing, alignment and detailed design which will contribute to local distinctiveness, complement the built form and scale of heritage assets and respect the character, appearance and setting of the locality;
 - d. demonstrate a clear understanding of the significance of the asset and of the wider context in which the heritage asset sits, alongside assessment of the potential impact of the development on the heritage asset and its context; and
 - e. provide clear justification for any works that would lead to harm or substantial harm to a heritage asset yet be of substantial public benefit, through detailed analysis of the asset and the proposal.
- 10.60 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that a local authority shall have regard to the desirability of preserving features of special architectural or historic interest and in particular, listed buildings. Section 72 (of that Act) provides that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
- 10.61 Paragraph 203 of the NPPF states that when determining applications local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation.
- 10.62 Paragraph 205 of the NPPF requires that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Paragraph 206 (NPPF) goes on to state that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset [from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting] "should require clear and convincing justification".

- 10.63 Setting is then defined in the Framework as 'the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset and may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral'.
- 10.64 Paragraph 208 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
- 10.65 Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.
- 10.66 Policy 62 seeks the retention of local heritage assets and where permission is required, proposals will be permitted where they retain the significance, appearance, character or setting of a local heritage asset.

Siting/layout and landscaping

- 10.67 Compared to the previous proposal, Block B has been rotated 14 degrees whilst Block C has been rotated 3 degrees. In addition, Block C has been re-sited further to the east. This in effect closes the gap between the two residential blocks, resulting in a reduction of views towards Anstey Hall compared to the previous proposal.
- 10.68 Following a formal consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer and Historic England, it is considered that the central vista which would be framed by the new blocks would be completely alien in character. As third party/local groups note, the residential blocks' extensive footprints and their siting would compromise the Hall's surviving open and garden setting.
- 10.69 Furthermore, whilst the introduction in principle of refuse and cycle storage provision is welcomed, the cycle storage would fail to be integrated into the development nor would be convenient to users, contrary to policies 55 and 57 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 10.70 Whilst the improvements in reinstating the ha-ha and the overall landscaping strategy are supported, the proposed scheme would significantly reduce the open character of this park and garden and on this basis and following formal comments from the Landscape and Urban Design Officers, it is considered that the proposal would be contrary to policies 55, 56, 57, 61 and 67 of the Local Plan 2018.

Residential blocks' design, form and scale

- 10.71 The surrounding Trumpington Meadows estate and the Conservation Area is characterised by smaller fine grained plot formations with varied pitched roofs and chimneys further articulating the roofscape. Conversely, the proposed buildings would measure between 85m and 95m in length and consist of a coarser grain that is further emphasized by the continuous three storey flat roof form which is considered to appear excessively horizontal and one intrusive mass.
- 10.72 The application has been subject to formal consultations with both the Council's Conservation Officer and Historic England. Differing third party/local group comments concerning the design and impacts are noted. The concept of the proposal is to open up views of Anstey Hall from the surrounding public vantage points. However, in considering the application, the proposed residential blocks' form and appearance would neither be of an appropriate design in the context of Anstey Hall itself nor in the context of the local area and Trumpington Conservation Area.
- 10.73 The applicant's heritage responses are noted, however, the siting of such large blocks would be an alien and incongruous addition that would fail to be related to the Hall in terms of its design, location and scale. Whilst landscape mitigation is proposed to soften and minimize the perceived visual impact, users' experience of the setting of the Hall, particularly from the public realm to the south and within the application site itself would be adversely impacted.
- 10.74 In addition, the proposed blocks would fail to reflect the key qualities of the local area, Trumpington Conservation Area nor Anstey Hall itself and therefore fails to positively respond to the surrounding context, contrary to policies 55, 57 and 61 of the Local Plan 2018. With reference to the NPPF , the proposal would fail to enhance or better reveal the significance of the Hall itself nor the Trumpington Conservation Area as a whole.
- 10.75 Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to policies, 55, 57, 61 and 71 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2023.

Reconfiguration of wall onto Maris Lane

- 10.76 The applicant proposes to introduce a new opening in the curtilage boundary wall along Maris Lane. The existing wall is half-height in brick and likely to be contemporary. Following a formal consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, there is no objection to the proposed gates and piers, details of which could be controlled via condition.

Harm v public benefits

- 10.77 The NPPF states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight

should be). Given the Grade II* listing of Anstey Hall which places it in the top 5.8% of all listed buildings, the weight given to the asset's conservation including its setting should be great indeed.

10.78 Taking into account consultee comments including Historic England's comments, it is considered that the proposal would result in a high level of less than substantial harm upon the immediate setting and significance of Anstey Hall and upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to Policy 61 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF is therefore engaged and the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

10.79 The applicant has submitted a list of public benefits which include the following:

- Funds to complete the restoration/repair of the Listed Buildings and outbuildings, buildings and grounds in perpetuity, tree management and planting scheme.
- Restoration of historic main entrance, and the centreline of the original house.
- Transformation of land into a public park.
- Anstey Hall visible to Maris Lane and Trumpington Meadows.
- Fewer vehicular movements than existing use.
- Reduction in late evening noise.
- Meet demand of ageing population.
- Reduce instances of bed blocking.
- Reduce instances/cost of falls, and visits to A&E.
- Social benefits of reducing loneliness.
- Economic benefits through freeing up housing, increased spending and council tax generated.
- Biodiversity net gain.
- Energy efficient design.
- No tree damage.
- Opportunity for a full archaeological survey.
- Reduction in flood risk.
- Refuse truck entering/leaving the site.
- Cycle/mobility scooter storage and refuse bins.
- Optimum viable use for Anstey Hall with the traditional layout of rooms retained.
- Community use extended.
- Private medical resource on-site.
- Collection of paintings open to the public.
- Funds for a tree management and planting scheme.

10.80 In addition, the applicant states that the central facilities for the retirement community would constitute optimum viable use of Anstey Hall. In this instance, no plans have been submitted to reflect the change of use to this purpose and it is not reflected in the description of development. Notwithstanding this matter, the optimum viable use needs to be consistent with the conservation i.e. cause the least harm to the

significance of the heritage asset at the same time as being economically viable to be included as a public benefit. In this instance, officers do not agree that the proposed development constitutes optimum viable use consistent with the heritage asset's conservation. It is suggested that there are other optimum viable uses which the applicant could explore which would result in less or no harm to the significance of heritage assets.

- 10.81 The applicant states that the proposed development would help fund the restoration/repairs of the hall and its curtilage listed outbuildings. Third party comments regarding previous funds generated through other developments and lack of investment in Anstey Hall are noted. In this instance, the applicant has provided limited information on the repairs which are needed to be carried out. Whilst the funds generated could be secured via a schedule of works required through a legal obligation, the applicant has not argued that the development would enable development to secure the future of the heritage asset.
- 10.82 Whilst applicant and third-party comments state that the proposal would be of great benefit to the community and allow for use by local organisations and charities, it is understood that the existing hall already serves a number of ancillary uses for the local community and charities. Therefore, on this basis, it is not considered that the proposal would result in this public benefit.
- 10.83 The applicant's list of public benefits is acknowledged, however, following review, officers are in agreement that the following constitute public benefits:
- Funds to restore/repair Anstey Hall and outbuildings, secured via a legal agreement.
 - Restoration of the original access on Maris Lane, and creation of views of the historic frontage.
 - Transformation of protected open space to public park, secured via a legal agreement.
 - Fulfil a specialist housing need and social benefits through improved wellbeing.
 - Economic benefits through construction/employment and local spending.
- 10.84 Whilst the proposed development would result in some public benefits as listed above, it is not considered that the public benefits arising from the scheme would outweigh the high-level of 'less than substantial' harm identified, contrary to Paragraph 208 of the NPPF and Policy 61 of the Local Plan 2018.
- 10.85 In addition, the proposed development would fail to accord with Section 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires that a local authority shall have regard to the desirability of preserving features of special architectural or historic interest and in particular, listed buildings and ensures that special attention

shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

10.86 Tree impacts

- 10.87 Policies 59 and 71 of the Local Plan 2018 seek to preserve, protect and enhance existing trees and hedges that have amenity value and contribute to the quality and character of the area and provide sufficient space for trees and other vegetation to mature. Paragraph 131 of the NPPF advocates that existing trees are retained wherever possible.
- 10.88 The application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA). Trees of high arboricultural value would be retained and the current application would retain existing tree belts on the western and eastern boundaries of the site. Whilst third party/local group comments concerning the lack of drawings, loss of trees along Piper Road and risk of damage to neighbouring trees are noted, following a formal consultation with the Council's Tree Officer, there is no objection to the proposed development subject to an arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan, pre-commencement site meeting, retention of tree protection and replacement tree planting in accordance with Policies 59 and 71 of the Local Plan 2018.

10.89 Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Design

- 10.90 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.
- 10.91 Policy 28 of the Local Plan 2018 states development should take the available opportunities to integrate the principles of sustainable design and construction into the design of proposals, including issues such as climate change adaptation, carbon reduction and water management. The same policy requires new residential developments to achieve as a minimum water efficiency to 110 litres per person per day and a 44% on site reduction of regulated carbon emissions and for non-residential buildings to achieve full credits for Wat 01 of the BREEAM standard for water efficiency and the minimum requirement associated with BREEAM excellent for carbon emissions.
- 10.92 Policy 29 of the Local Plan 2018 supports proposals which involve the provision of renewable and / or low carbon generation provided adverse impacts on the environment have been minimised as far as possible.
- 10.93 The application is supported by an Energy Statement. Third party/local group comments on this document are noted.
- 10.94 The Council's Sustainability Officer are noted and following further discussion with the consultee, it is considered that in the event that the

proposal does not meet Part O under building regulations such as if the single aspect west facing facades need to be amended to introduce cross-ventilation, this would likely require significant amendments to the scheme and a revised application will need to be submitted.

- 10.95 The energy statement suggests a 69.9% improvement on the Part L 2021 compliant baseline and would comprise air source heat pumps (ASHPs). Although their location is unknown, there is no objection from the Sustainability Officer nor Environmental Health Officer regarding amenity concerns given that there is sufficient space within the site to accommodate these units. These details could therefore be conditioned to ensure to also ensure that the character of the area is preserved as third party/local groups note.
- 10.96 Further information has been provided by the applicant stating that they now propose to utilise ground source heat pumps instead of ASHPs. Notwithstanding archaeological concerns with development below ground, there is no objection to this approach subject to condition.
- 10.97 Water efficiency of 99.9 litres/person/day is proposed which can be conditioned on any planning consent granted.
- 10.98 Subject to the above conditions, including an energy and water smart meter, the proposal would be in accordance with Policy 28 of the Local Plan 2018 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020).
- 10.99 **Biodiversity impacts**

Impacts upon protected species

- 10.100 Policy 70 of the Local Plan 2018 states that development will be permitted which:
- a. protects priority species and habitats; and
 - b. enhances habitats and populations of priority species.
- Proposals that harm or disturb populations and habitats should:
- c. minimise any ecological harm; and
 - d. secure achievable mitigation and/or compensatory measures, resulting in either no net loss or a net gain of priority habitat and local populations of priority species.
- 10.101 Where development is proposed within or adjoining a site hosting priority species and habitats, or which will otherwise affect a national priority species or a species listed in the national and Cambridgeshire-specific biodiversity action plans (BAPs), an assessment of the following will be required:
- e. current status of the species population;
 - f. the species' use of the site and other adjacent habitats;
 - g. the impact of the proposed development on legally protected species, national and Cambridgeshire-specific BAP species and their habitats; and

h. details of measures to fully protect the species and habitats identified. If significant harm to the population or conservation status of a protected species, priority species or priority habitat resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission will be refused.

- 10.102 The Environment Act 2021 and the Councils' Biodiversity SPD (2022) requires development proposals to deliver a net gain in biodiversity which follows a mitigation hierarchy focused on avoiding ecological harm over minimising, rectifying, reducing and then off-setting. This approach is embedded within the strategic objectives of the Local Plan and Policy 70. Policy 70 states that proposals that harm or disturb populations and habitats should secure achievable mitigation and / or compensatory measures resulting in either no net loss or a net gain of priority habitat and local populations of priority species.
- 10.103 The application site is predominately grassland which is flanked on both sides by mature woodland. There are two statutory designated sites within 2km of the application site which are Byron's Pool and Nine Wells, both Local Nature Reserves (LNRs).
- 10.104 The River Cam, a County Wildlife Site (CWS) is situated 690m to the west, whilst Grantchester Road Plantations, Old Mill Plantation, Trumpington Road Woodland and Eight Acre Wood and Seven Acres which are all City Wildlife Sites (CiWS) are located within 1km from the application site.
- 10.105 Following a formal consultation with the Council's Nature Conservation Officer, previous ecology concerns including the loss of habitat, biodiversity net gain and lighting impacts have been addressed.
- 10.106 On this basis, subject to a sensitive lighting scheme and construction ecological management plan which could be conditioned on any planning consent granted, the proposal is in accordance with policies 57 and 70 of the Local Plan 2018.

Biodiversity net gain

- 10.107 The submitted DEFRA Biodiversity Net Gain Calculation report predicts a gain of 23.32% in habitat units and a 10.15% in hedgerow units from the proposal. On this basis, it is considered that the proposals would achieve the mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity. Conditions could be imposed to ensure that details of this are provided in addition to nest box provision/biodiversity enhancements in accordance with Policy 57 of the Local Plan 2018 and the Biodiversity SPD 2022.

10.108 Water Management and Flood Risk

- 10.109 Policies 31 and 32 of the Local Plan 2018 require developments to have appropriate sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems and to minimise flood risk. Paragraphs 159 – 169 of the NPPF 2021 are relevant.
- 10.110 The application has been subject to a formal consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).
- 10.111 In terms of the approach to sustainable surface water drainage, the flood risk and drainage strategy and additional information submitted addresses previous concerns raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and subject to conditions including a scheme of surface water drainage, measures to avoid additional surface water during construction, construction and confirmation of the drainage scheme and long-term groundwater monitoring, the proposed development is acceptable in accordance with Policy 32 of the Local Plan 2018.

10.112 Highway Safety and Transport Impacts

- 10.113 The application site is located within a highly sustainable location where there is existing good cycle and public transport routes to the city centre and shops and services located nearby.
- 10.114 Policy 80 of the Local Plan 2018 supports developments where access by walking, cycling and public transport are prioritised and is accessible for all. Additionally, Policy 81 states that developments will only be permitted where they do not have an unacceptable transport impact.
- 10.115 Paragraph 115 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.
- 10.116 The application is supported by a Transport Technical Note and the plans and documents have been reviewed by the County Council's Local Highway Authority and the Transport Assessment Team.
- 10.117 A new vehicular access onto Maris Lane is proposed. The inter-vehicle visibility splays are acceptable and there is no objection from the Local Highway Authority.
- 10.118 The proposal would use existing access roads, one of which already service Anstey Hall Barns to the north-west of the application site and the other which currently serves the Cosmex Clinic to the north-east of the application site. Third party comments concerning the increase in traffic along the former access road are acknowledged, however, given that this is a private track and vehicles travel at low speeds, any changes to this internal route is a matter for the applicant. The standard of this internal road to take any additional traffic/load is also a matter for the applicant/owner. Conditions to limit vehicle weight are suggested by the applicant to address these concerns.

- 10.119 Whilst third party/local group comments concerning the use of heavy construction vehicles are noted, following additional information and a formal consultation with the Local Highway Authority, it is not considered that any adverse highway safety impacts would result from the proposed scheme subject to a traffic management plan and construction/demolition vehicle weight restriction which could be attached as conditions on any planning consent granted. The applicant has indicated that construction/waste collection vehicles would use the eastern-most access which could be conditioned on any approval.
- 10.120 Whilst third party comments concerning the lack of pedestrian and vehicular visibility along Anstey Barns access road are noted, given that vehicles will be moving at low speeds, it is not considered that any significant highway safety impacts would result. The lighting and safety of this internal road is a matter for the applicant.
- 10.121 In terms of impact upon the highway network, whilst third parties have raised concerns, given the nature of the development and the review by the Transport Assessment Team, the proposed development would only have minimal additional traffic impact during the day and less during peak AM and PM hours. Whilst third parties have concerns about the date that this survey was carried out, there is no objection from the Transport Assessment Team.
- 10.122 Concerns are raised by the Local Highway Authority regarding the permeability of the site for walking/cycling. This matter has been discussed previously and in officers' view, whilst not proposed, there are opportunities to improve the pedestrian connectivity of the site both to Maris Lane and internally which could be conditioned within the landscaping details subject to any planning consent granted.
- 10.123 Request from the Local Highway Authority for a footway link from the eastern access to the southwestern side of Maris Lane is noted, however, it is not considered that this is reasonable or necessary given the existing footway on the northern side of Maris Lane and the heritage constraints bordering the carriageway on the southern side.
- 10.124 Taking all this into account, subject to conditions including a traffic management plan, falls and levels and bound materials, it is considered that the proposal accords with the objectives of Policy 80 and 81 of the Local Plan 2018 and is compliant with the NPPF.

10.125 Cycle and Car Parking Provision

10.126 Cycle Parking

- 10.127 The Cambridge Local Plan (2018) supports development which encourages and prioritises sustainable transport, such as walking, cycling and public transport. Policy 82 requires new developments to comply with

the cycle parking standards as set out within Appendix L of the Local Plan which, for retirement accommodation states that two cycle spaces should be provided for every 5 members of staff, whilst for nursing homes there should be an additional one visitor space for every 6 residents (minimum 2 spaces). These spaces should be located in a purpose-built area and be at least as convenient as car parking provision.

10.128 The proposed development comprises 72 covered cycle parking space (35 for residents and 37 for staff) and 10 visitor cycle parking spaces. In addition, storage of mobility scooter units would be provided for 10% of the units.

10.129 Whilst the quantity of cycle parking spaces is considered appropriate for a development of this nature and would meet the standards within Appendix L, as discussed previously, the cycle parking solution would lack integration into the proposed development. Furthermore, the siting of these cycle storage blocks as the Urban Design Officer concludes appear as an afterthought, which lack convenience for residents, staff and visitors close to the main entrance to the residential blocks, contrary to Policy 82 of the Local Plan 2018.

10.130 Car parking

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

10.132 Third party comments regarding the number of parking spaces and possible future parking pressure on nearby roads are noted. The proposed development would provide 22 spaces for residents in accordance with Appendix L. 18 spaces would remain for employees and visitors. It is also noted that there are several other car parking spaces at the front of Anstey Hall. On this basis and taking into account its highly sustainable location, the proposed car parking arrangement is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policy 82 of the Local Plan 2018.

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

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

10.135 Amenity

10.136 Policies 35 and 57 of the Local Plan 2018 seek to preserve the amenity of neighbouring and / or future occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance, overshadowing, overlooking, or overbearing and through providing high quality internal and external spaces.

Neighbouring Properties

10.137 Whilst third party comments concerning overshadowing and privacy impacts upon occupiers in vicinity of the application site are noted, the proposed retirement home accommodation would be located a reasonable distance from the closest residential properties to the west, along Piper Road and to the south along Proctor Drive. The closest neighbouring residential dwelling would be approximately 34 metres from the balconies of Block C wing.

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

10.139 On this basis, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any significant overlooking, overbearing, loss of light or noise impacts upon nearby neighbour amenities in accordance with policies 55 and 57 of the Local Plan 2018.

Future Occupants

10.140 The proposed development would comprise specialist housing in the form of retirement accommodation (C2 use) and therefore Policy 50 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) is not engaged as this relates to C3 residential units.

10.141 Notwithstanding the above, in comparison to the technical space standards required for 3person 2 bedroom apartments, the proposed retirement accommodation would provide generous internal space for future residents.

10.142 The proposed development would introduce new residential accommodation facing Waitrose Supermarket. The accommodation would be a reasonable distance to not result in significant overbearing or loss of light impacts upon future residents, nor noise impacts from the existing supermarket.

10.143 The application has been subject to a formal consultation with the Council's Environmental Health Officer and no objections have been raised subject to restrictions on the hours of use of the public park and plant noise assessment/mitigation. Whilst limited information has been provided regarding how the security and privacy of residents within the proposed accommodation would be managed, it is considered that these details could be dealt with via condition. According to the plans submitted, residents will each have their own private patio/balcony area, which is sufficient.

Accessibility

10.144 The application site allows for step free access to it. Level access is proposed at the entrances to the accommodation Blocks' cores in accordance with Part M4(2) Building Regulation standards. A lift is proposed within each of the blocks. Following a formal consultation with the Council's Access Officer there are no objections to the scheme subject to internal design alterations which could be adjusted at detailed build stage to further meet the needs of all users. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 56 and 57 of the Local Plan 2018.

Construction and Environmental Impacts

10.145 Policy 35 of the local Plan 2018 guards against developments leading to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise and disturbance. Third party comments are noted and noise and disturbance during construction could be minimized through conditions restricting construction hours and collection hours, dust and piling to protect the amenity of existing occupiers. These conditions are considered reasonable and necessary to impose on any planning consent granted.

Artificial lighting impacts

10.146 In terms of impacts upon the local amenity and quality of life, no details of external lighting have been provided. Whilst third party comments are noted, in terms of impacts upon human receptors, details could be conditioned in accordance with Policy 34 of the Local Plan 2018.

Potential contamination

10.147 A Phase 1 Desk Study has been submitted as part of the application. Following a formal consultation with the Council's Environmental Health Officer, given the sensitive end-use, conditions could be attached to safeguard workers and future residents in accordance with Policy 33 of the Local Plan 2018.

10.148 To ensure that any need to import ground-based materials to the application site is chemically suitable for use, a condition will be included

to any planning permission requiring a material management plan in accordance with Policy 33 of the Local Plan 2018.

Summary

10.149 In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed development would be in accordance with Policies 33, 34, 35, 56 and 57 of the Local Plan 2018.

Archaeology

10.150 Paragraph 200 of the NPPF 2023 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected...Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

10.151 Third party/local group comments are noted. Following a formal consultation with the County Council's Archaeological Officer, it is considered that the application site has a very high archaeological potential particularly given that there is known Anglo-Saxon settlement and burial grounds bounding the site. In this instance, the applicant has failed to provide the requested evaluation prior to determination and therefore insufficient information has been provided and is contrary to Policy 61 of the Local Plan 2018 and Paragraph 200 of the NPPF 2023.

10.152 Third Party Representations

10.153 The remaining third-party representations and local group/petition representations not addressed in the preceding paragraphs are summarised and responded to in the table below:

Third Party Comment	Officer Response
Damage to neighbouring wall	This is considered a civil matter outside of this planning assessment.
Pedestrian access onto Piper Road	The submitted plans do not indicate any pedestrian access onto this road.
Public access to facilities	It is understood that charities and organisations will continue to be able to access the hall. The previous swimming pool within the orangery has been removed from this application.

10.154 Planning Obligations (S106)

10.155 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any

planning obligation in relation to three tests. If the planning obligation does not pass the tests then it is unlawful. The tests are that the planning obligation must be:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

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

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

Heads of Terms

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

Obligation	Contribution / Term	Trigger
Primary Health Care	£71,189 based on 87 units	Prior to occupation
Ambulance Service	£29,580	Prior to occupation
Monitoring fees	£2,200 plus further £500 per obligation	N/A

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

10.160 Other Matters

Refuse

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

10.162 Four bin stores would be sited with two bin stores serving Block C and two serving Block B. Maintenance staff would move the wheeled bins to the collection point near the eastern access to the site on collection days whilst a swept path analysis of a refuse vehicle has been provided to demonstrate that this is achievable. Further details have been requested by the Shared Waste Team which could be conditioned on any planning consent granted in accordance with Policy 57 of the Local Plan 2018 and the RECAP Waste Guidance Document.

Crime prevention

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

Fire safety

10.164 The application demonstrates that fire services could access the internal road network and therefore there are no objections with regards fire safety. Following a formal consultation with the Fire and Rescue Services, subject to provision of fire hydrants which could be conditioned, there is no objection.

Public Art

10.165 The applicant has submitted their intention to provide public art in the application site which is supported subject to condition.

Submitted plans/documents

10.166 Following discussion during the application process, the applicant has stated that Anstey Hall itself would serve as the central facilities for the residents of the retirement apartments with accommodation for visitors and staff on the upper floors. Whilst this is noted, unlike the previous application, no plans have been submitted of Anstey Hall itself this time around and therefore there is uncertainty with regards the use/s within the hall. Furthermore, despite no longer proposing the orangery, the proposed elevation showing the orangery and its link with Anstey Hall remain in the proposed elevations (from the last application).

10.167 The visualisations found within the revised design and access statement have been nominally amended to remove the orangery, however, the inclusion of the additional cycle/bin stores and the further narrowing of the central open space parkland have not been reflected in this submitted material.

- 10.168 The applicant has suggested that a time limit be imposed on the existing portacabin type building, however, without plans indicating its use, and assessing any replacement, officers of the view that this cannot be left to condition.
- 10.169 Taking this into account, the plans and documents submitted with the application are insufficient and do not reflect accurately the proposed development, contrary to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

10.170 Planning Balance

- 10.171 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).
- 10.172 The proposed development would result in economic benefits through the construction of new buildings, servicing the retirement complex and local spending, social benefits through the creation of meeting specialist housing need in the form of retirement accommodation. These are given substantial weight in the planning balance in favour of the scheme. The scheme proposes public art which is attributed limited weight in favour of the scheme.
- 10.173 The proposal would convert existing private protected open space into publicly accessible land, albeit, this would be limited to daylight hours. Whilst this is welcomed, conversely, the proposal would consume a substantial portion of this protected open space which is important in views from Trumpington Meadows and is of high environmental value. The proposal would significantly narrow the existing open landscape whilst this protected open space would not be satisfactorily replaced. This is attributed substantial weight in the planning balance against the scheme.
- 10.174 The proposal would result in a biodiversity net gain within the site slightly in excess of policy requirements and is attributed limited weight in the planning balance in favour of the development.
- 10.175 Finally, the proposed accommodation blocks would result in a high level of less than substantial harm to heritage assets. Whilst the proposal would restore the original access onto Maris Lane and funds generated could be directed to restore/repair Anstey Hall and its outbuildings, overall, the public benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh the harm to character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II* Listed Building. This is attributed great weight in the planning balance against the scheme.
- 10.176 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the statutory requirements of sections 66 and 72 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas)

Act 1990, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is recommended for refusal.

10.177 Recommendation

10.178 **Refuse** for the following reasons:

1. By virtue of the retirement accommodation blocks' siting, the proposal would significantly encroach into existing protected open space and adversely impact its character. In this instance, the proposed development would fail to adequately replace the protected open space lost through the site's redevelopment. Therefore, the principle of this development on the edge of the city and within the Protected Open Space is contrary to policies 8 and 67 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
2. The proposed retirement accommodation blocks and cycle storage provision, by virtue of their siting within Anstey Hall's open and garden setting would significantly reduce the open character of this protected open space. Additionally, by virtue of the accommodation blocks' incongruous design and appearance, the proposal would fail to appropriately relate to Anstey Hall in terms of their design, siting and scale, resulting in adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of Trumpington Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Building (Anstey Hall). In addition, the proposed cycle storage would fail to be successfully integrated into the development. Therefore, overall, the proposal would fail to positively respond to the surrounding context, existing features of historic and local importance and the setting and special character of the city, contrary to policies 8, 55, 56, 57, 61 and 67 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. The harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to the setting and significance of Anstey Hall is identified as 'less than substantial' harm and it is not considered that the public benefits arising from the scheme would outweigh this identified harm. The proposal is contrary to policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and Paragraph 208 of the NPPF 2023, and the provisions of section 66 and 72 of Planning (LBCA) Act 1990.
3. The proposal fails to provide cycle storage that is convenient and accessible to meet the needs of the elderly, employees and visitors, contrary to policies 55, 57 and 82 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
4. The site is located in an area of very high archaeological potential and an evaluation is required prior to determination. In this instance, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the principle of the retirement accommodation blocks in this location is acceptable in archaeological terms. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2019 and the NPPF 2023.
5. Given the lack of floor plans for Anstey Hall, the uncertainty regarding its proposed use and the proposed elevation of Anstey Hall still showing the

orangery, the drawings and information submitted as part of the application are insufficient and do not reflect accurately the proposed development. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Background Papers:

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

- Cambridge Local Plan 2018
- Cambridge Local Plan SPDs