

Application Number	17/2245/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	22nd December 2017	Officer	Sav Patel
Target Date	13th April 2018		
Ward	Petersfield		
Site	Mill Road Depot Mill Road Cambridge CB1 2AZ		
Proposal	The erection of 182 dwellings (including 50% affordable housing), 51sqm of floor-space consisting of Use Class B1 (Business) or D1 (Non-Residential Institutions) - in the alternative, basement car park (101 spaces), surface water pumping station, open space (including play area), alterations to the junction with Mill Road, together with associated external works including cycle parking and landscaping.		
Applicant	Cambridge Investment Partnership C/o Agent		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed development would make effective and efficient use of brownfield land and provide 50% affordable housing; - The proposed design and scale of the development is of high quality and would not have a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or the setting of the Listed Building; - The proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding residents;
<p>RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>APPROVAL</p>

0.0 BACKGROUND

- 0.1 This planning application has been submitted by Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) which is a joint venture company set up by Cambridge City Council and Hill Investment Partnership. The purpose of the partnership is to help increase the amount of affordable housing within Cambridge. The target is to provide 500 new dwellings across the City using mainly council owned sites/assets. The City Council has received £70million support from central government as part of the Devolution Deal to help achieve this target.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The application site area is 2.15 hectare and located within Petersfield ward. Romsey ward is located on the other side of the railway tracks. The site forms most of the current Mill Road Depot site. This is because the garage blocks to the north off Hooper Street and the two storey gatehouse and car parking area to the south are not included in the application site boundary. Some of the garage owners have long terms leaseholds and the gatehouse and car parking area is proposed to be redeveloped as the new site for the YMCA, which is currently on Gonville Road. The forthcoming YMCA application will be submitted as a separate planning application and will be considered on its own merits. I have not assessed the impact of the proposed YMCA development in this report as the details have not been finalised.
- 1.2 As for the current red line boundary site, it contains a variety of buildings of different scales and ages. A separate planning application has been approved for their demolition (17/2192/FUL). The site is covered entirely by hardstanding. In terms of orientation, to the north of the site is Hooper Street and Ainsworth Street which are Victorian streets with two storey terrace housing. There is a small commercial use between the rear gardens of the Ainsworth Street properties and railway line. To the east, the site abuts Network Rail land which includes the railway line. To the south, beyond the car parking, are a group of Lime trees and beyond is Mill Road and the beginning of the Mill Road bridge. The western boundary of the site abuts the rear boundaries of the properties in Kingston Street. Kingston Street extends along the entirely length of the western boundary. There are also two commercial units fronting Mill Road west of the access road. To the east of the access road is the former free library building (most recently Bharat Bhavan/ICCA)

and next to this is the language school which is joined to 119b Mill Road which is a small two storey dwelling.

- 1.3 The site falls within the Mill Road Conservation Area (character 1 area) and the former free library is a grade II Listed Building. Directly on the opposite site on Mill Road is a row of properties that are designated as Buildings of Local Interest. The site does not contain any Tree Preservation Orders. There are three Silver Birch trees along the northern boundary of the site within the Women's Resource Centre site, which are protected by virtue of being in the Conservation Area. The site also falls within a Controlled Parking Zone (H).
- 1.4 The site is not allocated for any use/development within the current Local Plan (2006). However, the entire Mill Road Depot site is a proposed allocation in the Draft Local Plan 2014 (site R10). The draft allocation identifies the site as being suitable for housing with an approximate capacity for 167 dwellings. The site is also located within the Mill Road Opportunity Area (Policy 23) of the draft Local Plan.
- 1.5 A Draft Planning and Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) has been prepared and was approved by the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 22 March 2017. The SPD has not been adopted as it is pending the adoption of the new Local Plan. However it is material consideration. The SPD is based upon the entire Mill Road Depot site which is 2.7 hectares.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposed development is for 182 dwellings in the form of apartment blocks and houses. 50% (91) affordable housing (social rent) is proposed and would be managed by Cambridge City Council as a registered provider of affordable housing. The draft SPD for the site proposed 40% affordable housing. The proposal would also include a basement car parking for 101 car parking with lift access, 541 cycle spaces (all sheffield stands), new areas of public highway, areas of open space to be maintained by the Council, pump station, accessible dwellings and provision along the entire eastern boundary for the Chisholm Trail in the form of a 6 metre wide strip of land.
- 2.2 The residential development is in four main parts; the west side mews terrace; the central core; the Hooper Street elements; and the apartment blocks along the eastern boundary.

- 2.3 The proposed mews terrace would consist of 14 units and located adjacent to the western boundary of the site. The main mews street terrace would consist of two storey terrace dwellings with mono-pitched design roofs and set 3 metres off the western boundary. The mews terrace would include an outdoor terrace at first floor and measure 6.9 metres in height. The mews terrace also includes a feature three storey detached building (known as B.09) which would consist of two 1bed flats and on the first and second floor, and B1 or D1 use on the ground floor. B.09 would be set 2.2 metres from the western boundary and measure 9.25 metres in height. B.09 would be first building visible from the access road.
- 2.4 The central core would consist of three storey flat roof town houses and two storey gabled fronted terraces enclosed between new streets, Headly Street to the south and Eagle Green to north. The central core would consist of 31 dwellings in the form of detached, semi-detached and terrace housing. The three storey town houses would measure 9.7-9.8 metres in height and the two storey houses would measure 7.2-7.3 metres in height.
- 2.5 The Hooper Street elements would consist of a two storey pitched roof terrace located on the back edge of the pavement and a three storey duplex block known as B.08 located behind the garage block. The two storey terrace would be 9.1 metres in height and B.08 would measure 10.8 metres in height. B.08 would consist of a two storey units on the ground and first floor with private garden to the rear. The second floor would contain a separate self-contained apartment with outdoor terrace.
- 2.6 The six apartment blocks along the eastern boundary range from four to six storey. B.02 would be a six storey flat roof building measuring 21 metres in height. B.02 would contain 25 (1 and 2 bed) apartments. B.03 and B.04 would be five storey flat roof block with a subservient pitched roof metal plant enclosure on the roof. These blocks would measure 16.5 metres to the flat roof and 18.4 metres to the top of the plant enclosure. These blocks would consist of 15 apartments (30 in total). B.05 would be five storey with a four storey section facing the eastern boundary. B.05 would consist of 22 apartments and measure 17.6 metres in height. The four storey element would measure 14.4 metres in height.
- 2.7 The bin storage provision would be contained within the footprint of each block to serve it occupiers. Some cycle parking would also be

located within footprint of the blocks some within external stores connected to the relevant blocks. B.02 and B.05 would contain cycle lifts to the basement to provide ease of access. B.02 would also contain a cycle stair as an alternative means of access and exit for cyclists. Each block would enable access for refuse vehicle/collector to access the bin stores from Eagle Foundry Street.

- 2.8 Each dwelling and apartment block would include provision for its own secure cycle and bin storage.
- 2.9 The proposal includes two main areas of communal open/green space to be known as Eagle Park and Eagle Foundry Street Open Space. Eagle Park would be located at the northern end of the site and include a play park. The other area of open space would be located between B.02 and B.05. This area would not contain a play park as it would be a lawn space with seating area. The SPD for the site states that subject a detailed design process any future scheme could indicatively accommodate approximately 20% to 25% of the site area as open space. This range includes the Chilsholm Trail. The proposed open space (including Chisholm Trail) equates 28%.
- 2.10 The proposal also includes pedestrian access into the site from Hooper Street to enable surrounding residents to use the open space within the site. This access would be located between H.49 and H.48. Vehicular access from this point would be restricted by three bollards but allow pedestrians and cyclists access. The bollards could be lowered to allow emergency vehicle access into the site.
- 2.11 In the north east corner of the site will be the main entrance to and exit from the Chisholm Trail. Adjacent to this and north of apartment block B.07 is proposed to be a pumping station which is required to enable surface water drainage from the site.
- 2.12 The proposal has had extensive pre-application discussions/meetings with Council Officers. The applicant has also engaged the public/stakeholders in two public exhibitions, which were held at the former free library building on 19 June 2017 and 2 November 2017.
- 2.13 The following documents have also been submitted in support of the application:
 - Air Quality Assessment;

- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal;
- Daylight/Sunlight Reports;
- Design and Access Statement;
- Flood Risk Assessment and Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy;
- Utilities Assessment;
- Heritage Statement;
- Phase 1 and Phase II Land Contamination Assessments;
- Landscape Management Plan;
- Lighting Strategy;
- Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment;
- Planning Statement;
- Statement of Community Involvement;
- Transport Assessment;
- Travel Plan;
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment;
- Construction Phase Health and Safety Plan;
- Energy Strategy Report;
- Overheating Analysis;
- Town and Views Assessment

2.14 Additional technical note/report/test results and plans relating to transport, drainage, ground contamination have been submitted in response to consultee comments, as well as a supporting statement for the key design changes.

2.15 Since the original planning application for 184 dwellings was submitted, the proposal has been amended to address concerns. The amendments consist of the following:

- The total unit number has been reduced by two to 182 (91 affordable – 50%);
- The fifth floor of B.05 has been removed to reduce views of it from Ainsworth Street which were considered to have a detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area;
- B.09 has been pulled off the western boundary and redesigned to reduce the impact on the occupiers in Kingston Street;
- The range of uses classes within the ground of B.09 has been revised to B1 (business)/D1(non-residential institutions) only and the ground floor has been reduced from 71sqm to 51sqm;
- The rear elevation of B.08 has been revised to address concerns with its appearance from Hooper Street;
- A new dwelling has been introduced to the western end of the Hooper Street terrace;

- Chimneys have been included on the Hooper Street terrace to improve their visual articulation;
- The Hooper Street terrace elevation has been amended so they read as pairs of dwellings;
- Details of the Headly Street access to the Chisholm Trail and open space has been provided;

2.16 I am anticipating that further information will be submitted shortly regarding the existing community use on the site and I will deal with this on the Amendment Sheet.

2.17 I have consulted relevant consultees on these amendments and re-consulted all the residents that adjoin the site in Kingston Street and the residents facing the site in Hooper Street. I have also re-consulted all the neighbours that made comments on the original proposal.

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
17/2192/FUL	Demolition of existing buildings and structures	APPROVED

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER

Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/4 3/6 3/7 3/8 3/11 3/12 3/13
		4/10 4/11 4/12 4/13 4/14
		5/1 5/5 5/9 5/10 5/11 5/12 5/13 5/14
		8/1 8/2 8/3 8/4 8/5 8/6 8/10 8/16
		10/1

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

Central Government Guidance	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Circular 11/95 (Annex A)</p> <p>Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard – published by Department of Communities and Local Government March 2015 (material consideration)</p>
Supplementary Planning Guidance	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP): Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)</p> <p>Affordable Housing (January 2008)</p> <p>Planning Obligation Strategy (March 2010)</p> <p>Public Art (January 2010)</p>
Material Considerations	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p>

	<p>Cambridge City Council - Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) (2012)</p> <p>Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (2010)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>Mill Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan that should be taken into account.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

1st comments

6.1 The following issues were raised:

- Alterations to the proposed junction with Mill Road are acceptable in principle subject to a detailed design and safety audit;

- The layout is acceptable in principle, subject to provision of a dimensioned drawing showing all street width (carriageway and footway) junction radii and visibility splays, both at junctions and bends.
- Confirmation required of the extent of internal street (if any) that are intended for adoption as public highway.
- The proposal introduces several new street trees and planting. The Highway Authority is no longer able to accept additional street trees or planting as it cannot undertake the ongoing maintenance burden of these. If trees are required as part of the proposal the future maintenance will need to be undertaken by others.
- Additional linkage for pedestrians and cyclists is needed, for instance, close to Headly Street through to the Chisholm Trail
- Square edged parking spaces bounded by kerbs and planting will become rubbish traps and make access difficult, parking bay ends should be splayed. Ends of on-street parking bays should provide dropped kerbs to allow those with a mobility impairment access.
- Dimensions for the proposed car parking spaces must be provided, which should measure 2.5m x 5m for parking perpendicular to the street, 6 metres by 2 metres wide for those longitudinal to the street.
- The application proposes off-gauge cycle parking provision at ground level. Given that this is likely to be the most desirable cycle parking, how will this be protected for use by those who most need it?
- To provide manoeuvring diagrams for large family cars accessing car parking spaces on a larger scale plan of the basement car park.
- All single garages should have a minimum internal measurement of 6m x 3m with an opening of a minimum of 2.2m. Please show the dimensions on the drawings.
- On-street parking will need to be protected to restrict its use to visitors to the site, requiring a Traffic Regulation Order. The

proposal will require alteration of the existing Traffic Regulation Order controlling on-street parking.

- If, following provision of the above, the Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposal will have no significant adverse effect upon the public highway, please add the following conditions and informatives to any permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue in regard to this application.

- No unbound material to driveways;
- Remove permitted development rights for gates;
- Vehicular access to be laid out and constructed to CCC specification;
- Drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off;
- Details of future management and maintenance of streets;
- Copy of management and maintenance details sent to LPA;
- Manoeuvring area to be retained free from obstruction;
- Access free from obstruction;
- Contact Highway Authority about future public highway;
- Traffic Management Plan and informative;
- Works to highway informative;
- No overhanging highway informative;
- Public utility informative;

6.2 2nd comments following in response to additional information:

- The layout is acceptable in principle, subject to provision of a dimensioned drawing showing all street width (carriageway and footway).

- The forward visibility splays must be provided within adoptable public highway. This has not yet been demonstrated to be the case and therefore the Highway Authority **OBJECTS** to the proposal until this issue is resolved.

- It is recommended that the Developer's consultant arrange to meet with the Highway Authority to resolve this.

- The garage entrances on some properties are too restricted in width, resulting in a manoeuvre that risks damage to vehicles, or unreasonable difficulty for drivers.

6.3 3rd comments in response to further information submitted:

- The layout is acceptable in principle, subject to provision of a dimensioned drawing showing all street width (carriageway and footway).
- Sett paving is not acceptable within the public highway. It will create additional noise and vibration and the Highway Authority cannot afford the ongoing maintenance costs of the material. This was explained at pre-application stage. The Highway Authority therefore **OBJECTS** to this aspect of the proposal as it would frustrate the developer's intention to adopt the highways
- The forward visibility splays must be provided within adoptable public highway. This is has not yet been demonstrated to be the case and therefore the Highway Authority **OBJECTS** to the proposal until this issue is resolved.
- It is recommended that the Developer's consultant arrange to meet with the Highway Authority to resolve this.
- The garage entrances on some properties are too restricted in width, resulting in a manoeuvre that risks damage to vehicles, or unreasonable difficulty for drivers.
- It's not clear what is proposed for the houses – the DAS indicates that the cycle parking is within the curtilage of the building but the plan at the bottom of the page seems to show it in the back garden which is not what is recommended in the draft Local Plan we say we are adhering to.
- Access to the ramped steps and lift to the basement is through 2 sets of doors which I would suggest is not acceptably convenient. I can't find any indication of how steep the ramp would be.
- Access to the Chisholm Trail is an issue;

6.4 4th comments on information in response to issues raised so far:

- The plans show doors opening outwards across what is intended to be the Chisholm Trail. This would introduce a risk of collision and door strike that needs to be designed out: pedestrians accessing directly onto the trail would be at risk without some form of buffer from which they could assess the safety of entering onto the route.
- Access between the Chisholm Train and wider area needs to be as free as possible: the two access points shown are the minimum that should be provided. As much additional permeability should be available between the two points shown: the possible link between the bin stores between the flats appears blocked by a fence: is this a permanent feature?
- Sett paving is not acceptable within the public highway. It will create additional noise and vibration and the Highway Authority cannot afford the ongoing maintenance costs of the material. If sett paving is still proposed then the Highway Authority would **OBJECT** to this aspect of the proposal as it would frustrate the developer's intention to should the highways
- The forward visibility splays as shown are acceptable
- It is not clear what is proposed for the houses by way of cycle parking – the DAS indicates that the cycle parking is within the building but the plan at the bottom of the page seems to show it in the back garden. The latter approach is not what is recommended in the draft Local Plan.
- Access to the ramped steps and lift to the basement is through 2 sets of doors. I have discussed this with my colleagues in the Cycling Projects Team and they suggest that is not acceptably convenient. I can't find any indication of how steep the ramp would be.

5th comments:

Comments to awaited

Transport Assessment Team (County Council)

I set out below a summary of the comments received:

Transport Assessment:

The TA asserts that road conditions will not worsen as a result of this proposal and thus there will not be any accident issues. However this assertion does not take into consideration the tidality of flows as there will be an increase in vehicle trips during the PM peak hour.

The County Council would expect the length of the CT to be provided as part of the development and that a proportionate contribution towards its implementation.

The data from which car parking numbers have been calculated must be submitted as part of the assessment. It is noted that car parking levels proposed on the site are less than those taken from the 2011 census data in the surrounding streets. Justification for this must be included.

The impact from car parking on the surrounding unrestricted and over prescribed streets has not been considered in sufficient detail.

Depending on the methodology used for trip calculation and the trip distribution, it is possible that PM peak trips could increase by around 30 trips, which the threshold for junction testing. There may be a requirement to test other junctions on the network.

The modelling of the access junction should also be updated to reflect the above comments in relation to the trip rates. However it is likely that the increase in trips would not cause any issues at this junction given the low RFC values in the original modelling.

Travel Plan – response to the submitted Travel Plan document:

Section 6.1, Table 9 – In order for the travel plan to reflect the Transport Assessment, the trip rates and subsequent generation will require revision to reflect the Transport Assessment.

Section 6.1, Table 13 – This should be revised in accordance with comments in respect of the Transport Assessment.

Para. 7.2.1 – The measures proposed are acceptable. However there should be more commitment to their implementation rather than saying they ‘could’ be implemented.

Section 7.3 – Again the Travel Plan must show more commitment to the measures.

Section 9.1 – Travel surveys over the first 5 years are welcomed. However it is unclear how the development trips will be monitored after this period (if at all).

Section 9.2 – It is unclear as to how long it is proposed that the Travel Plan Coordinator is in post, this must be clarified.

Section 9.3 – Clarification must be given as to the proposed level of funding.

Conclusion

The application as submitted does not include sufficient information to properly determine the highway impact of the proposed development. Were the above issues addressed the Highway Authority would reconsider the application.

CCC therefore requests that this application not be determined until such time as the additional information above has been submitted and reviewed.

2nd comments in response to the applicant response to the above comments:

Comments awaited

Environmental Health

1st comments – following discussions about further work/testing that was requested at pre-application and required to be carried prior to submitting the application.

6.5 A Scope of Works for supplementary intrusive investigation prior to demolition of the site was submitted for approval. Additional information has been submitted following my comments in the memo dated 26th January 2018.

6.6 Having reviewed the additional information I can confirm that the proposed supplementary testing is acceptable however additional information is still required on the proposed ground gas monitoring.

2nd comments following gas and monitoring test results and results from infiltration testing:

6.7 Contaminated land:

- On review of all available data to date, it is clear that safe (residential) development of this site will only be achieved with suitable, effective and feasible remedial/protection measures. Those measures will need to be designed and approved by the LPA based on all available data from all phases of investigation and provide protection against the worst case conditions identified.
- Additional intrusive investigation is required post demolition. A Scope of works will need to be submitted to the Local Authority for approval prior to the work being undertaken. The Remediation Strategy will need to be based on a valid and up to date risk assessment and Conceptual Site Model that are based on the results of all intrusive investigation works carried out on the site.
- The Environment Agency will need to be consulted by the LPA on the results of the groundwater monitoring and sampling and the potential risks to controlled waters.

6.8 Air quality:

- Based on the information provided we have no objections on air quality grounds for the proposed development; although conditions to secure the use of low NO_x boilers, limit emission levels from CHP and ensure that both the EV charge points and car club are installed should be secured by use of conditions.

6.9 The proposed development is acceptable subject to the following conditions:

- Contaminated Land conditions (1 to 6);
- Construction hours;
- Collection during construction;
- Construction noise/vibration & piling;
- Dust;
- Plant noise;
- Building Ventilation Scheme;
- Noise Insulation Scheme;
- Building Vibration Assessment;
- Winter Gardens;
- Lighting;
- Community/retail use hours;

- Amplified music hours;
- Community/retail building insulation;
- Odour condition;
- Duct work for A3 use;
- Combined Heat and Power;
- Furnace/boiler/plant implementation;
- NOx Boilers emission;
- Electric Car Charging Points;
- Car Club;
- Site investigation informative
- Remediation works informative
- Materials chemical testing informative
- Contaminated land guide informative
- Construction noise/vibration informative
- Dust condition informative
- Food Registration / Safety and Licensing Act 2003 Informative

3rd comments – following amendment of proposal description which removes A Use Classes:

6.10 If the A uses have now been removed the following conditions:

Odour condition – A1 & A3 use

Prior to A1 and A3 use of the development within building B.09, details of equipment for the purpose of extraction and filtration of fumes and or odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved extraction/filtration scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such.

A3 ductwork condition

Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, details of the location of associated internal and external duct work associated with building B.09, for the purpose of extraction and/or filtration of fumes and or odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details as approved shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Keep the community / hours of use conditions, just remove reference of A1, A2, A3 within the text of the condition.

Refuse and Recycling

1st comments

- 6.11 The suggested collection points and locations are unclear. The width of the internal access road appears to be too narrow in sections. Therefore either more work is required to demonstrate these issues are addressed or a condition is applied.

2nd comments:

Comments to awaited

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.12 Given the importance of urban design considerations and impacts on the Conservation Area I have set out the comments of the Conservation Officer and Urban Design Officer more fully than usual at Appendix Two.

The amendments that have been made to the plans have addressed the initial objections from the Urban Design officer but the Conservation Officer retains his objections.

Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)

- 6.13 A range of measures are proposed to meet the requirements of 8/16 such as:

- Provision of electric vehicle charging points;
- Provision of a dedicated car club space;
- Cycle parking provision above adopted standards;
- Integration of sustainable drainage features such as bio-swales, rain gardens and bio-retention areas;
- Photovoltaic panels and gas fired Combined Heat and Power for the apartments which would reduce carbon emissions beyond energy efficient baseline by 24% which is fully supported;
- Installation of mechanical ventilation shall be properly installed in line with design assumptions and maintained in the long term. User guidance for residents is recommended;

These measures are all supported.

The following additional information has been requested:

- Clarification as to the level of water efficiency sought for the scheme as this is not clear from the submitted information and the

Energy Strategy Report includes references to 125 litres/person/day. Emerging policy requires water efficiency of 110 litres/person/day, which is equivalent to the level sought in the HDA's Housing Design Guide. Note that this could be dealt with by way of condition (see wording suggested above).

- With regards to climate change and overheating, I would strongly recommend that moving forward, additional modelling using the 2050 weather data be undertaken to help inform whether further measures may need to be implemented in the future.

2nd comments following submission of additional information:

- 6.14 Analysis expanded to give consideration of 2050 climate change data which is welcomed. What this additional analysis does show is that there is a risk of overheating for some of the units analysed when future climate scenarios are taken into account. Therefore further consideration should be given to whether there may be a need for additional external shading for some units, or whether the scheme can be future proofed to more easily enable the provision of shading in the future.

It is noted that the Design and Conservation Panel have queried the location of pv panels on east and west facing elevations, although shallow pitch of these roofs will limit loss of output on these elevations. Any loss of output could also be compensated for by the use of either microinverters or an optimising device, albeit this would result in additional cost.

Planning Policy

First comment

Housing:

- 6.15 The proposed housing development is acceptable in terms of quantum of housing. The application proposes a slight increase in unit number over the SPD but this does not appear detrimental to the overall design and function of the site.

Open space:

- 6.16 The proposed open space equates to 28% of the site area, which will also be accessible to existing residents surrounding the site. The

amount and type of open space proposed is considered acceptable in relation to *Policy 3/8* and the Mill Road Planning and Development Brief.

Protection of Existing Facilities:

- 6.17 The application proposes the relocation of Cambridge Women's Resources Centre. No evidence has been provided as to whether a suitable alternative venue has been found for the Community Group, which is still actively used by its members.

Development leading to the loss of a Community Facility will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that the facility can at least be replaced at its existing level and quality within the development, or be relocated to another appropriate premises or site of similar accessibility for its users. The relocation of the facility has been mentioned within the application's Planning Statement, but has not been appropriately evidenced therefore the application is not considered acceptable until appropriate evidence is provided.

Community facilities:

- 6.18 *Policy 5/12 New Community Facilities* supports the development of new community facilities. To this end the provision of a community facility within the development would be considered in compliance with the policy. There is concern however, over the proposal to provide this in the form of 72m² of community / retail space (D1, A1, A2 or A3).

Policy 5/12 encourages the use of flexible buildings, such as community centres or halls that can be designed to accommodate as many different community or leisure activities as possible. A dual use could be considered appropriate, however little detail is provided to enable adequate assessment to ensure conformity with the policy.

It would be recommended that measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of the development (loss of community facilities) through the intention to provide further community facilities within a future phase of development should be set out within the Planning Obligations for this application. This will ensure that the whole site is considered in a holistic manner and that the application complies with *Policy 3/6*

Ensuring Coordinated Development and Policy 10/1 Infrastructure Improvements by demonstrating that due consideration has been given to safeguarding appropriate future development on the remainder of the site.

Second comment

I will deal with further comments regarding the existing community facilities on the Amendment Sheet as necessary.

Access Officer and Disability Panel

6.19 See Disability Panel comments below:

Building Regs Part M4 (3) – wheelchair accessible ground floor flats. The Panel would encourage the designers to be forward-thinking and ensure that if a bath is to be fitted, then the drainage should allow for the space to be converted into a wet room if necessary; avoiding costly conversions at a later date.

Parking provision for utility, delivery vehicles and carers etc (for the apartments). The ability to receive on-line deliveries has become a crucial element to how many disabled people maintain their independence. With deliveries and carer visits often made in the evening, short-stay bays or laybys would be needed as close as possible to the apartments, as using the basement provision would not be practical and may inhibit some deliveries or visits being made. The Panel note that visitor bays are to be provided but that these would not be time-limited. How these bays would be used would be a management issue.

Refuse collection.

The Panel were informed that the apartments would have communal bins accessible at the core of each block which would be served by a lift. Concern was raised as to how a wheelchair user would open these large bins.

Building Regs Part M4 (1) – private houses only ‘visitable’ by the disabled. The Panel were informed this was due to the limited space available at ground floor for a fully accessible bathroom.

The Panel stressed that measures put in place now such as the capacity for a through-floor lift and walls capable of taking hoists would result in homes for the longer-term; already adaptable to the changing needs of their residents.

Accessible parking bays (in the basement). The Panel questioned the usefulness of these spaces as most disabled residents would need a dedicated parking space outside their property.

Social housing allocation. The Panel would encourage the allocation to be made at an early stage in order to establish any conversion/adaption requirements.

Bathroom doors. The Panel would recommend the use of sliding doors as these are easier to operate and particularly useful where space is limited.

Shared spaces (but not shared surfaces). The Panel welcome the segregation of the pedestrian spaces from the carriageway and would encourage this in all areas where wheelchair users, those with site or hearing impairment or those with pushchairs may feel vulnerable when sharing the environment with vehicular or cycle movements.

Play area. Equipment for use by disabled children would be welcomed as well as seating for disabled parents/guardians.

Conclusion.

A welcome scheme that needs to re-visit some aspects of disabled living but has the potential to be a high quality living environment suitable for a wide variety of residents.

Growth Project Officer

6.20 The proposal is acceptable in terms of affordable housing provision.

- The application exceeds current SPD requirements for 40% affordable housing by providing 50% across the site.
- The application exceeds the 75% social rented requirements of the affordable housing by providing 100%.
- The clustering within blocks, at between 15 and 19 units, accords with SPD requirements of between 6 and 25 dwellings.
- Although the application does not meet the preferred mix of dwelling types and bed spaces, it fits the current need with a

majority of one and two bed properties in predominantly flatted accommodation.

- The design quality, materials, elevations and streetscape ensure that the proposal for the affordable housing remains tenure blind.
- No more than 12 dwellings per floor can be accessed via a common stairwell.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

6.21 I have concerns regarding the space available for new planting and we need more information regarding the impact of development on the Kingston Street trees. Therefore, at present I am unable to support the scheme and recommend that the layout be altered to accommodate sustainable tree cover of a stature that reflects the size and massing of the development.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

First comments

6.22 We are reluctant to support the landscape proposals for the Mill Road Depot site as the submission does not give assurance that a good quality landscape scheme can be delivered. Two issues are concerning in particular; 1) we are not convinced that the landscape could be successfully integrated with the sustainable drainage scheme which is insufficiently thought out and does not comply with current policy, and 2) there is inadequate space allowed for planting and in particular tree planting. Also see the Drainage and Arboricultural Officers comments.

It should be borne in mind that we do not believe that a successful landscape scheme can be brought forward through conditions given the current level of information submitted. We have given detailed comments below and indicate at the end of the document where issues could be covered by condition.

The information below is appropriate for conditions. All other information above should be provided prior to determination.

- **Play areas** - including play equipment, fencing, gates, planting, surfacing and furniture.

- **Hard Paving Materials** - We note that the materials have not been precisely specified. A condition should be imposed to specify the materials. We will also require sample panels to illustrate the product and the laying design/jointing.
- **Revised planting plans** - Detailed, revised planting plans including schedules, planting size and densities.
- **Boundary treatments** – all boundary treatments except site perimeters which require detailing prior to determination.

Second comments following review of additional information in response to initial comments:

6.23 The proposed development is acceptable subject to conditions:

- Hard and soft landscaping;
- Sample panel of materials;
- Sustainable Urban Drainage/Landscape Features;
- Details of the play areas

Commentary

6.24 We welcome the revisions to the landscape submission for the Mill Road Depot site some of which have dealt with our concerns. However there are still some landscape elements that remain only partially resolved. These are mainly related to drainage and to tree planting.

Tree planting:

We welcome the reduction of tree numbers to allow for improved rooting space and volume. Nevertheless we remain convinced that the trees between the parking bays on Eagle Foundry Street, Headly Street and Eagle Green are very vulnerable to being damaged by cars manoeuvring in and out of the bays and would rather omit these trees from the scheme. We do not support the idea put forward that simply because the trees will be in private ownership they will be better care for. It is a matter of accidental damage to the trees and once damaged, the easiest and cheapest solution would be to

simply remove the damaged tree leaving a stump and a superfluous tree grille in the public realm.

Please bear in mind that this is Romsey which is an area of high density housing with fewer trees than other areas of the city. It would be much preferred that the tree planting that can be achieved is good quality and sustainable.

Removal of the trees also clears the route for bringing bins out to the road and solves the problem of insufficient branch and rooting space.

Drainage

The status and design of the sustainable urban drainage features in the landscape (rills, swales etc.) remains somewhat unknown and will depend on future soakage tests as to whether the proposed approach and design is practical. If for instance some or all of the features need to be lined they probably cannot remain as grassed features as they will remain wet for too long resulting in them being unsuitable for use as park/play spaces. If this is the case, the design of these features will need to be changed to a more engineered approach.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management)

First comments

6.25 Object to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Oversized pipes are not considered to be sustainable drainage features and their use should be a last resort once all other options have been exhausted – no justification to use oversized pipes has been provided;
- Pumping of surface water is an unsustainable drainage method. Pumps require ongoing maintenance and can fail during a storm event – gravity discharge is preferred;
- In order to comply with the drainage hierarchy, on site infiltration testing in accordance with BRE 365 will be required to determine ground conditions;

- Site investigations demonstrate that groundwater is relatively shallow in areas with proposed basements. The effect of groundwater on basements and the requirements for flood resilience measures (e.g. impermeable membranes) to be implemented should be considered;
- The permeable paving area has not been incorporated into the impermeable area for the hydraulic calculations;
- The FRA and correspondence with Anglian Water suggests that there will be two separate surface water connections from the site (Mill Road and Hooper Street), however only one (Hooper Street) is shown on the drainage plans - clarification on this is required.

Second comments following infiltration testing results

6.26 The infiltration test results demonstrate that the site is more than adequate for infiltration to be employed. It is recommended that there is no reason why central band of the development cannot incorporate infiltration features such as soakaways to deal with all water from the site. Adopting this approach could potentially remove significant volumes of water from the surface water pump system and negate the use for a pumped solution in all but the most extreme events. It is recommended that the applicant updated the drainage strategy to incorporate this.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

First comments:

6.27 The proposed development is unacceptable and should be refused for the following reason:

- The surface water drainage strategy for the proposed development is considered to be unsustainable and has not demonstrated that the drainage hierarchy has been duly followed. In detail, the proposed strategy includes a pumped discharge to a surface water sewer with oversized pipes to provide attenuation. This is considered one of the least sustainable approaches to surface water drainage and is not supported by Cambridge City Council.

The submitted surface water drainage strategy does not differ to that tabled at pre-planning application meetings where the Council's drainage team raised concerns.

The existing site is currently drained via gravity and the reasons for requiring a pumped discharge are not accepted by the Council. Infiltration may be feasible across the site and whilst this may not provide the whole solution, it may prevent a pumped discharge needing to be made.

One of the primary constraints for the inclusion of SuDS within the proposed surface water drainage strategy is the density of the proposed development. There is little space to include above ground SuDS features which limits the amenity, biodiversity, quality and quantity benefits that can be achieved. If more space were made available within the site layout, then the same volume of attenuation would not need to be provided below ground which may remove the need for unsustainable oversized pipes and a pumped discharge. A site constraint which has been created by the applicant's development design is not considered reasonable justification to promote an unsustainable drainage strategy.

Groundwater levels have been identified across the site with varying results. Notably, WS2, WS08, WS12 and BH7 have all identified groundwater around 2 mbgl. These investigatory points are where the proposed basement is identified and the submitted FRA has not assessed what impact the proposed basement will have on groundwater levels in the vicinity of the site. Whilst the FRA assesses the site is at low risk of flooding from this source, it has not detailed whether any measures are required to ensure the development is resilient to flooding, in particular the basement.

Second comments following infiltration testing results

- 6.28 The City drainage team concurs with the LLFA comments on the infiltration test results and recommendations.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

- 6.29 No objection subject to bird box condition.

Historic England

6.30 Historic England have very serious concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds due to the overly dominant visual impact on the Mill Road Conservation Area that would result from the height of the majority of the apartment blocks along the eastern boundary, adjacent to the railway line.

We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 131 and 137.

Environment Agency

6.31 No objection the principle of the proposed development. Planning permission could be granted to the proposed development as submitted if the following conditions (and informatives) are included. Without these conditions the proposed development poses unacceptable risk to the environment and we would object to the application.

- Remediation Strategy to deal with the risk associated with contaminated land;
- Contamination not previously identified then work to stop on site until remediation strategy has been approved;
- Scheme for surface water disposal;
- No piling or other ground penetration methods shall be permitted unless otherwise agreed in writing;
- Surface water drainage informative;
- Foul water drainage informative;
- Pollution prevention informative;
- Wildlife enhancements informative;

Anglian Water

Wastewater treatment:

6.32 Foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Cambridge Water Recycling Centre which currently does not have capacity to treat the flows of the development site. However Anglian Water is obligated to accept the flows and take the necessary steps to ensure there is sufficient capacity.

Foul Sewerage

6.33 Development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. A drainage strategy will need to be prepared in consultation with Anglian Water to determine mitigation measures.

A condition recommending the drainage strategy covering the issue(s) to be agreed.

Surface water disposal

6.34 The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is unacceptable. No evidence has been provided to show that the surface water hierarchy has been followed.

The following conditions are recommended the LPA is minded to grant approval:

- Foul Sewerage Network;
- Surface Water Disposal;

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Services

6.35 If minded to approve then adequate provision should be made for fire hydrants which is secure by condition or S106 agreement.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary (Architectural Liaison Officer)

6.36 The proposed layout appears to be acceptable from a crime and the fear of crime perspective. With a mixture of housing (50% affordable), open space, retail and community buildings this development lends itself very much to the principles of Secured by Design.

Sport England

6.37 Sport England does not provide detailed response in this case as the proposal does not fall within either our statutory or non-statutory remit.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Education)

6.38 See 'Planning Obligations Section of this report.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

6.39 Our records indicate that the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential, situated in the Romsey area of Cambridge. The Mill Road area was developed for terraced housing in the late 19th century. Consequently there has been little archaeological investigation in the vicinity. There is however evidence for Saxon activity in the vicinity, including burials recorded to the north-west (Historic Environment Record reference 04622). Finds of Roman date have also been recorded in the vicinity (04626, 04702). In addition, the O.S. 1st Edition 25" (1885) records a series of buildings in the centre and west of the site, including The Eagle Iron Foundry, a coprolite mill and a timber yard, served by a spur from the main railway line. The 3rd Edition (1926) lists the site as the Corporation Depot, with a reconfiguration of the structures on site.

We do not object to development from proceeding in this location but consider that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation secured through the standard archaeology condition.

Design and Conservation Panel Meeting(s) of 6 September 2017 and 14 February 2018.

6.40 The conclusions of the Panel meeting of **6 September 2017** were as follows:

The Panel were broadly comfortable with the approach applied to the overall layout and location of the housing and vehicular circulation. However, the departure from the SPD and the resulting scale and massing of the higher elements, together with their impact on the open space and the wider Conservation Area were issues of particular concern.

Since a development of this density will be inconsistent with the existing character and appearance of the Conservation Area, there is a need to weigh the resulting harm against the public benefit of the social housing provision, and whether such harm is justified. The Panel will leave such questions for the Planning Committee Members to consider.

The Panel concluded it would be inappropriate to vote on the proposals at this stage, but would like to re-visit the scheme at a

future meeting following a firmer steer from City Council Members and officers on the issue of density, and once the design has been developed further.

6.41 The conclusions of the Panel meeting of **14 February 2018** were as follows:

The challenge being faced by the design team to deliver new homes on a large scale and within this sensitive location is understood. Despite the obvious public benefits of both removing a current blight on the Conservation Area and the provision of significant numbers of affordable housing, the Panel must express its reservations. How a Conservation Area evolves in order to provide new homes on a brownfield site is the fundamental issue at the heart of this scheme.

VERDICT – GREEN (2), AMBER (4) with 1 abstention.

The relevant section of both the minutes of the panel meetings are attached to this report as Appendix Three

Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit

6.42 See 'Planning Obligations Section of this report.

6.43 Some of the responses set out above are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

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

- 17 Ainsworth Street;
- 82 Ainsworth Street;
- 90 Ainsworth Street;
- 92 Ainsworth Street;
- 5 Brackyn Road
- 41 Butt Lane, Milton;
- 50 Cavendish Road;
- 58 Cavendish Road;

- 140 Cowley Road (The Bike Depot)
- 6 Edward Street;
- 53 Great Eastern Street;
- 6 Golding Road;
- 2 Gunhild Close;
- 113 Gwydir Street;
- 7 Heffer Close (Stapleford);
- 14 Hooper Street;
- 15 Hooper Street;
- 23 Hooper Street;
- 39 Howard Road;
- 9 Kingston Street;
- 18 Kingston Street;
- 20 Kingston Street;
- 30 Kingston Street;
- 37 Kingston Street;
- 40 Kingston Street;
- 72 Kingston Street;
- 41 (Raeburn House) Lapwing Avenue;
- 17 Lilywhite Drive;
- 119b Mill Road;
- 1 Pearson Court, Milton;
- 15 Shelly Garden;
- 54 St Barnabas Road;
- 10 Sturton Street;
- 14 Sturton Street;
- 21 Sturton Street;
- 80B York Street;
- Petersfield Area Community Trust;
- South Petersfield Residents' Association;
- Cambridge Part Present and Future;
- Cambs Cycle Campaign;

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Representations to the original scheme -

Principle of development;

- Housing development on the site is supported;

Design, scale, layout and heritage;

- Building B.09 is unacceptable due to its design, height and proposal to use red brick within the Conservation Area;
- B.09 would be out of scale and character with the existing houses in Kingston Street and contrary to the SPD;
- B.09 should be removed and the proposed two storey mews continued in its place;
- Concerns with the proposal not following the guidance in the SPD in terms of number of dwellings (167 to 184) and increased storey heights (B.02, B.05 and B.09);
- Concerns with the amount/density of development on the site;
- The length of the two north-south street are out of character the local streets;
- The 5 storey blocks extending 40 metres into the site from the railway would appear out of character with the local urban grain;
- The proposed layout does not offer encouragement to pedestrians to walk in or around this area;
- Too much car parking is proposed;
- The contrast in between B.09 and B.02 is too great;
- 6 storey buildings either side of the railway line (Ridgeons) will create an unusual and dark corridor;
- No mention of Free Library as part of the proposed development or its restoration and repair;

Residential amenity;

- Building B.09 would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the residents in Kingston Street in terms of overshadowing/loss of light, loss of privacy and enclosure;
- Concerns with the impact from the proposed ground floor uses in B.09 on residents in Kingston Street in terms of noise/disturbance, environmental;
- Concerns with overlooking from the windows in the side of B.09;
- Concerns with the location of the proposed bins store for B.09 and the noise and odour impact this would have on residents Kingston Street;
- Concerns with potential vermin infestation;
- Concerns with security if side access is not gated;
- No information showing the impact of overshadowing of residents in Great Eastern Street and Cavendish Road;
- Overlooking impact from the proposed apartment blocks on the gardens Great Eastern Street and Cavendish Road;
- Impact from noise pollution on residents in Great Eastern Street from the barrier of buildings;

Highway safety/car parking/traffic generation;

- Concerns with increase in traffic generation on Mill Road bridge – tunnel or cycle bridge across the site would benefit the local community;
- The proposed parking provision is not adequate and will put additional pressure on surrounding streets;
- Concerns with the mode split estimates, distribution of trips onto highway, junction capacity issues, use of PICADY to assess capacity in the Transport Assessment;
- Concerns with potential increase in accidents on Mill Road which is an existing accident cluster site;
- Site access should be redesigned and a pedestrian crossing with traffic lights installed to improve highway safety;
- Residents of new development should not be entitled to participate in the residents parking scheme;
- Residents parking scheme should be introduced to cover Hooper Street, Sturton Street and Ainsworth Street to prevent non-residents/commuter parking;
- Concerns with the potential for the Hooper Street access to be used as a rat-run for motorcycles/mopeds;
- In this sustainable location car parking should be reduced;
- Too much car parking is proposed for this development – should be car free – provision of car parking increases cost of each dwelling by £15-20,000;

Open space/landscaping, cycle parking and Chisholm Trail (CT);

- Additional housing would place more pressure on open space which is limited in St Matthews area and YMCA will not provide an additional space;
- Improvements to the overgrown weed infested planted area of Hooper Street should be proposed to provide attractive gateway into site;
- Concerns with the size of the gardens for the family houses;
- Access to the CT between the dwellings is poor and will leave it underused and open to crime;
- Play areas are too disjointed;
- Cycle parking should be greater and more accessible;
- Concerned with the isolation of the CT – development turns it back on the CT and not conducive to encouraging full use of it, contrary to policy 3/7 and 8/5;
- Concerns that the CT will turn into a long, dark, unwelcoming back alley;

- The development is impermeable to the CT route and concerned with the lack of information about the CT in the application;
- Concern with the removal of the intermediate links to the CT south of the Hooper Street access;
- Concerns the quality of the CT is being diluted;
- Concerns with the lack of consideration for ecology;
- Eagle Park should be located along the southern side of Hooper Street to make it inviting to local residents;
- Concerns with access to the cycle lift in B.02 – doors are not wide enough should be 1.2 metres not 1.0 metre.
- Some provision for larger cycles such as adapted cycles and cargo cycles on the ground floor or accessible via the lift;

Other issues;

- Concerns with the increase in population on local services such as nurseries, schools, doctors and dentists;
- The non-residential space for small businesses is supported;
- Concerns with the proposal for retail and food space on the site considering location of Mill Road shops;
- Retail use is not necessary on the site;
- Concerns with no community centre provision – this should be provided;
- Concerns with the loss of the Women's Resource Centre without any alternative site;
- Concerns with lack of community facilities and additionality that would result in the YMCA proposal;
- Concerns with the accuracy of the red line plan and ownership of the land – the application should be returned unprocessed to the applicant;
- The brick pillar at the foot of the bridge is owned by Network Rail by they have not been notified and no details of the proposed remodelling of the foot of the bridge have been submitted;
- There must be a thorough site investigation for contaminants before any proposal to build;
- Any demolition or building work on the site using pile drivers could potentially lead to below ground contaminants being disturbed, leaking out into the groundwater;
- Concerns with the potential increase in air pollution caused by engines running to leave/enter a one entrance site on to or off an already congested, heavily trafficked road;
- 50% affordable housing needs to be guaranteed – how will this be achieved;

- Concerns with splitting the application into two applications (YMCA site) as this creates a very significant risk to public benefit;
- Concerns with the state of the Free Library building;

Comments on the amended plans received on 26 February 2018:

- Concerns with the impact from increased traffic generation;
- The mews houses overlook and block light into the adjacent Kingston Street properties;
- Concerned with the loss of two silver birch trees (instead of one originally) and the impact on birds;
- Concerns with the reduction in the number of trees within the development;
- Disappointed the revised plans have not addressed concerns raised about inclusion of a Women's Resource Centre;
- The revised plans do not address concerns with the height of the apartment blocks;
- Concerns with the impact of car parking on the surrounding streets and air pollution associated with increased vehicle movements;
- The revised B.09 is still three storey and has not overcome previous concerns;
- The dark grey brick for the mews houses is would not out of character;
- Concerns with the quality of neighbourhood life if properties are rented out to short term tenants;
- Concerned with the future height of the rear serving the Kingston Street properties when buildings are demolished;

7.3 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Principle of development
2. Affordable Housing
3. Context of site, design and external spaces and impact on heritage assets

4. Public Art
5. Renewable energy and sustainability
6. Disabled access
7. Residential amenity
8. Drainage
9. Refuse arrangements
10. Highway safety
11. Car and cycle parking
12. Third party representations
13. Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

Principle of Development

Housing

- 8.2 The site is not allocated within the adopted Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and is therefore a windfall site in policy terms. The site is a brownfield within a predominantly residential area characterised by terraced housing along Kingston Street to the west and Hooper Street to the north. The existing use is an anomaly in this environment. Therefore, the principle of redeveloping this site for housing would be compatible with surrounding context. The principle of residential development on the site is supported by the adopted Local Plan in accordance with policy 5/1.
- 8.3 The whole site is a proposed housing allocation site (R10) in the emerging Local Plan 2014. This is a draft allocation, however some limited weight can be given to residential redevelopment of the whole site through the draft Local Plan.

Draft Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document (2017)

- 8.4 The draft Planning and Development Brief (SPD) which promotes residential development on the whole site has been agreed by the Council as a material consideration in decision making for planning applications, albeit not formally adopted. The draft SPD is a desk based guidance document for this specific area to provide planning and design guidance to developers to help guide the preparation and assessment of future planning applications for this site. This draft SPD is material consideration for any proposed development which will need to comply with the policies in the adopted Local Plan (2006).

8.5 The draft SPD requires the site to provide the following elements:

- 167 residential units (40% affordable) including ancillary uses such as café/workspace;
- Dedicated community provision;
- A single point to vehicle access into the site with improvements to the junction;
- Indicatively accommodate approximately 20% to 25% of site area as open space;
- Provision for the Chisholm Trail including a minimum 6 metres right of way
- A range of building heights with 3 to 4 storeys along the railway line; including opportunity for a taller building adjacent to the south-east corner;
- Pedestrian and cycle links through the site from Hooper Street;

8.6 Notwithstanding the specific elements above, the principle of residential development on the application site is acceptable.

Relocation of the Women's Resource Centre

8.7 The proposal includes the loss of the Women's Resource Centre which in policy terms is regarded as a community facility. The draft SPD requires re-provision of this use and Local Plan (2006) policy 5/11 (Protection of Existing Facilities) states that development leading to the loss of community facilities will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated :

- a) The facility can be replaced to at least its existing level and quality within the new development; or
- b) The facility is to be relocated to another appropriate premises or site of similar accessibility for its users; or
- c) That there is no longer a need within the local community for the facility or that the need can be adequately met at an alternative facility of similar accessibility for its users

8.8 The applicant has worked with the WRC to find an alternative location and several options were put forward. I have sought further information on this issue and will provide an update on the Amendment Sheet. Subject to a satisfactory outcome the development is compliant with Policy 5/11..

Other ancillary uses

8.9 The need for non-residential uses/facilities as part of the development was identified during consultation on the preparation of the Planning and Development Brief SPD. Page 51 of the SPD states “The exact approach will be dictated through the development of a more detailed brief”. The SPD also states the following uses will be considered:

- Flexible community space such as a new hall or community meeting room will be considered;
- The demand and need for a nursery space will be explored;
- Other non-residential such as bespoke workspaces/art studios; and
- Potential for a suitably located small café

8.10 In view of the above, the applicant proposed to introduce A1 (retail), A2 (financial and professional services), A3 (food and drinks) or D1 (non-residential institutions) use classes to the ground floor of B.09. However, following significant concerns with the range of A use classes, particularly A1 and A3, the applicant agreed to modify the range of the use classes by removing A use classes and proposing B1 use (business) or D1 use (non-residential institution) instead. The ground floor space of B.09 was also reduced from 72sqm to 51sqm.

8.11 The delivery of these facilities is discussed further in the ‘planning obligations’ section below. The proposal is in accordance with the SPD and the provision of these facilities is supported in principle in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 5/12 and 10/1

8.12 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policies 5/10 and 10/1.

Affordable Housing

8.13 The proposal commits to the delivery of 50% of the proposed residential dwellings as affordable housing. Based on the proposed 182 dwellings, this would deliver 91 affordable homes. This is 10% above the minimum required for affordable housing within the adopted Local Plan policy 5/5, Affordable Housing SPD (2008) and the draft SPD (40%). The 50% affordable housing commitment would be secured through a S106 Agreement.

8.14 The proposed housing mix and tenure is set out in the below table:

Affordable mix (91)

Houses and maisonettes mix	Number of units
2-bedroom houses	2
2-bedroom maisonettes	4
3-bedroom houses	9
3-bedroom maisonettes	2
Total	17 (19%)

Apartments	Number of units
1 bedroom	44
2 bedroom	30
Total	74 (81%)

- 8.15 The Council's Growth Projects Officer has advised that this is an acceptable mix of affordable housing.
- 8.16 Local Plan policy 5/10 requires housing development sites of 0.5ha - or capable of accommodating 15 or more dwellings - to provide a mix of dwelling sizes and types for market as well as affordable housing. The Mill Road Depot SPD also encourages a range of building and housing types in a mixture of houses and flats that is informed by housing market dynamics, approach to tenure and disposition of open space.
- 8.17 The proposed affordable housing is based upon the latest housing needs figures and 10% more than the minimum requirement. In these terms, therefore, the proposed housing mix is acceptable.
- 8.18 In my opinion the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/5 and 5/10, subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement.

Context of site, design and external spaces and impact on heritage assets

- 8.19 This section of the report will address the two key elements of the application. The first section will assess the site context, the key opportunities and constraints of the site and how these have been reflected in the scheme. These matters could be regarded as relating to aspects of urban design and I have had support from Urban Design officers in reaching my conclusions. The second section will assess the impact of the proposed development, particularly the apartment blocks, on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and the setting of heritage assets, with reference particularly to the comments from the Conservation officers and Historic England. In the concluding paragraph of this

latter section I shall summaries the balance between the harm to heritage assets against the public benefits of the development.

Site context

- 8.20 The site is currently an operational City Council owned site that contains various uses ranging from offices to motor repair station to storage. The site almost entirely covered by hardstanding and contains very limited greenery. There are trees located within the WRC site. The site is set approx. 100 metres back from Mill Road and behind the language school building and former free library building making is largely unnoticeable from Mill Road. This is picked up in the Mill Road Conservation Area Appraisal (MRCAA) which states the depot site is “surprisingly discreet”. This is the only reference to the depot site in the MRCAA. In terms of the public realm, the site mainly visible from Hooper Street and Mill Road bridge. Whilst the site is visible from the Mill Road access road, views into the site are limited due to the location of the coach house building. The site is currently not visible from any focal points such as the Mill Road cemetery, St Matthew’s Piece or Romsey recreation field.
- 8.21 Mill Road itself contains an eclectic mix of uses and architectural forms on both sides of the railway tracks. Commercial uses dominate the south side of Mill Road and the northern side is mainly in residential use but there are parades of commercial uses. The housing development off/behind Mill Road is mainly characterised by long rows of two storey 19th century terrace houses on the back edge of the pavement. There are more varied forms and styles on Mill Road ranging from two and three storeys with examples of traditional pitched roofs, hipped roofs, projecting gables and pitched roof dormer windows.
- 8.22 The Mill Road Depot site is located in a part of the Mill Road Conservation Area that is characterised by two terrace housing with regimented frontages.
- 8.23 The main constraints of the site are the single access point which is off Mill Road which is a busy route for car, cyclists, pedestrian, buses and delivery vehicles. The site is also enclosed on the western by the rear gardens of Kinston Street and to the north by Hooper Street which is a quiet residential street that terminates at the railway line boundary. The railway line to the east is also a major constraint due to noise and vibration.

- 8.24 In terms of opportunities, the site represents a large brownfield site within a highly sustainable location in close proximity to shops, services, bus transport (buses and rail) and city centre amenities are nearby. There are also opportunities to improve access from Hooper Street into the site and to Mill Road. The site represents a significant opportunity for a key part of the Chisholm Trail to be delivered.
- 8.25 In terms of the proposed development, I set out below my assessment of each part of the new development and its impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and listed building.

Kingston Mews (H.10 to H.22)

- 8.26 Kingston Mews is proposed to contain a two storey mews-style terrace on a similar footprint to the coach house, which it would replace, and a three storey semi-detached flat roof town house range opposite. At the southern end of the mews terrace adjacent to the main entrance into the site a three storey building is proposed (B.09). The mews would be 9.5 metres wide with the houses set on the back from the pavement with a small (650mm deep) defensible space. The pavements are proposed to be 1.8 metres wide and the carriage way 5 metres wide. Each dwelling in Kingston Mews would contain an integral garage. The combination of a narrow road with integral garages would contribute towards helping to reduce/control vehicle speeds along the Kingston Mews, which is a long linear road resembling the surrounding streets.
- 8.27 Currently the coach house range forms the rear boundaries of the dwellings in Kingston Street. The proposed two storey mews consist of 13 units and will be set off the western boundary by 3 metres to provide a small courtyard. The roof line would slope away from the rear boundary from a height of 5.9 metres to 6.9 metres. Each dwelling in the mews terrace would have access to a first floor outdoor terrace which faces into the mews street. The proposal would therefore provide greater separation whilst maintaining the position of the boundary wall but reducing its height to 2 metres (the method of deconstructing the boundary wall is subject to conditions contained in the planning application to demolish the buildings ref: 17/2192/FUL which was approved at planning committee on 7th March 2018). The level of separation between the mews and the dwellings in Kingston Street would vary (due to extensions being

added) but between the main rear elevations it would approx.19.5 metres.

- 8.28 In terms of design the mews terrace would appear as a consistent, well-articulated range with cohesive frontages. The two storey scale of the mews terrace is also appropriate for this location and would comply with the design guidance which guides the building height to continue to the roof line of the existing coach houses. The coach house block varies in height from approx. 5.9 metres to 6.9 metres in height. The difference in height is between the two storey element and single storey element. Therefore, it is important that any future boundary with the Kingston Street properties is provided at a consistent height.
- 8.29 In terms of design and scale the proposed mews terrace is acceptable and would respond positively to the extended two storey terrace dwellings in Kingston Street.
- 8.30 The five three storey semi-detached town houses would add contrast to the street scene of the mews in terms of building height and layout. The town houses would also include side passages to access to the rear gardens. The side passage is a feature that is found in many of the surrounding streets. They also help to break up the massing of the three storey forms.
- 8.31 In terms of design the proposed town houses would have a consistent and well articulated appearance. In terms of scale, the town houses would be 9.7 metres in height and each pair 12.8 metres wide. Whilst 3 metre taller than the mews terrace, the applicant has demonstrated with the section plans that the relationship would be successful. These units would also comply with the building height parameter contained in the SPD which seeks typically 2-3 storey in this location. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed town houses are an acceptable respond to the surrounding context and SPD guide.
- 8.32 Block B.09 has been revised from its original iteration following concerns from officers and local residents. Originally B.09 was proposed to be a three storey building located on the western boundary with the Kingston Street dwellings. Its role was to provide a marker building as one enters the site from Mill Road. The ground floor was proposed to be in commercial or community use with two apartments above.

8.33 Local residents submitted a petition for a Development Control Forum raising concerns with the scale and proximity of the building to the boundary, range of proposed uses, and impact on residential amenity. The DCF was held on 14 February 2018 and the minutes of the DCF are attached in appendix 2 Following the DCF the applicant submitted revised plans taking on board the concerns raised by local residents for consideration. The revised plans were re-consulted on. The following changes have been made to B.09:

- Reduced from 3 storey to 2 ½ storey with rooms in the roof;
- The height of the building has been reduced by 200mm;
- Set off the western boundary by 2.2 metres;
- The roof form has been revised from flat roof to a pitched roof with the ridge approx. 7.1 metres away from the boundary;
- Apartments changed from 2 bed to 1 bed;
- Windows in the south elevation have been moved and reduced in size and the first floor window includes a privacy screen;
- Windows in the north elevation have been moved and proposed to be translucent;
- The colour of the brick has been amended to buff brick;
- The size of the ground floor space has been reduced from 72sqm to 51sqm;
- The proposed uses classes have changed to B1 or D1 only;
- The bin store the ground floor unit has been internalised;

8.34 Whilst the SPD guide development along the western boundary to continue the height of the coach house, I am satisfied that the revised height to B.09 is acceptable in this location. The revision reduces the boxy appearance of the original design and reads in my view as a more domestic form which is appropriate for this context. The building has been reduced in scale but would still be viewed as a marker building at the entrance of the site. The Urban Design team is also satisfied with the revision made to B.09.

Headly Street (H.04 to H.09)

8.35 Headly Street consists of a terrace of two storey gable fronted row of five dwellings with a three storey detached town house on the eastern end. The dwellings would be provided with 10 metre deep rear gardens and off street parking at the front of each unit. The two storey dwellings would be 7.2 metres to the ridgeline. The proposed two storey dwellings are well articulated with consistent and cohesive frontage. The scale of development is acceptable as within the parameters of the SPD.

8.36 The three storey town house would be similar to the proposed town houses in Kingston Mews but the Headly Street unit would be detached and provide the first step change in the transition from two storey to six storey for apartment block B.02. The town house is well articulated and consistent with the other town houses within the central core.

Block B.02 (6 storeys)

8.37 Block B.02 is located in the area that is identified in the SPD as an opportunity for taller development. The typical storey height for buildings along the eastern boundary is identified as 3-4 storeys. Therefore by definition, the taller building could be 5 storey. B.02 has been designed as a flat roof brick building with a steel frame façade on the northern elevation to mirror the same proposed features on B.05. The internal layout of the building has been carefully arranged to ensure there are no single aspects units facing the railway line. The apartments adjacent to the railway line have been made dual aspect and have been provided with winter gardens with movable glass screens which can be closed. B.02 also provides the main vehicle access into the basement via a ramp which is accessed via Headly Street. A pedestrian cycle ramp and cycle lift has also been provided to access/exit the basement.

8.38 The proposal is a six storey building which is 21 metres in height and contains 25 units. Whilst the SPD identifies this location for a taller building, in order to test its visual impact on the surrounding context, the applicant has submitted a Townscape and View Assessment (TVA) document. The TVA also takes into consideration policy 3/13 (Tall buildings and the skyline) of the Local Plan (2006). Policy 3/13 states that new buildings significantly taller than their neighbours will only be permitted if it can demonstrate that they will not detract from, amongst other things, local residential amenity; Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas and their settings; key vistas, the skyline and views within, over and from outside the City.

8.39 In consultation with officers, 21 viewpoints from publically accessible locations around the site taking in key vantage points, longer range views as well as more local views were agreed. The assessment has been undertaken to provide 'verified views' where key views were considered to be most significant/sensitive. The most sensitive views have been provided as full rendered visualization. These are limited to Mill Road Bridge (02), Hooper Street/ Kingston Street

junction (09) and Ainsworth Street (12). The TVA has demonstrated the site is surprisingly discreet, which is a description of the depot site that is supported by the MRCAA.

- 8.40 The assessment and methodology used in the TVA is consistent with best practice and guidance contained within Section 4.5 of the City Council prepared 'Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006)'.
- 8.41 The view of the proposed development from Mill Road Bridge would be the clearest and most notable from the public realm of B.02. The foreground view from the bridge towards the site is of the railway tracks and ancillary network rail buildings, power lines and infrastructure. The eastern edge of the site is defined by trees and small workshop buildings and storage areas. Therefore the current view of the site from the bridge is not particularly attractive and, in my view, does not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Following a review of the TVA the Urban Design Officer does not consider the additional height of B.02 to be harmful in urban design terms. The Conservation Officer however does consider the apartment blocks to be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I will set out my views on the impact on the Conservation Area in the latter part of this section.
- 8.42 Therefore, in terms of urban design and scale, I am satisfied that the additional storey of B.02 in this location being further away from existing residential development is acceptable.

Blocks B.03 and B.04 (5 storeys)

- 8.43 B.03 and B.04 are proposed to be five storey blocks. This is one storey above the SPD building height parameter. The additional height has been tested within the TVA and in my view is acceptable. B.02 would partially screen B.03 and B.03 would partially screen B.04 when viewed from the bridge. The bridge is the only publically accessible location that these blocks would be visible from. As commented on earlier, views from the bridge of the current site are not attractive. B.03 and B.04 would project off B.02 and start to appear smaller as they move further away from the bridge. In terms of internal space, the apartments have been arranged so that all the main habitable rooms and balconies face into the site. The bedrooms would have fixed windows overlooking the railway line but access to a small recessed area which would have a small opening

to allow cool air into the room. The recessed area would also act as an acoustic buffer.

8.44 The eastern elevation of B.03 and B.04 have been arranged to appear as matching and to also avoid appearing to turn their back on to the railway line. Whilst the railway is a constraint to the development it is important to ensure the design of the scheme responds positively to it. The proposed elevational treatment of the eastern elevation is an appropriate and acceptable response.

B.05 (5 storeys with a 4 four storeys pavilion)

8.45 Block B.05 is the most prominent building within the development due to its height, position within the site and proximity to existing residential development. B.05 was originally proposed to be 6 storeys (5 full storeys and 1 setback storey). B.05 also includes a four storey pavilion element which is located between B.04 and B.06. B.05 is also pulled away from the eastern boundary into the site by approx. 12 metres and acts as the book-end for both areas of open space. The building would also be visible from Ainsworth Street. The Urban Design Officer considered B.05 to be visually intrusive and incongruous when viewed against the finer grain and roofscapes of the housing in Ainsworth Street. Therefore the applicant was advised to amend B.05 by reducing its height and retesting its visual impact from Ainsworth Street.

8.46 The applicant revised B.05 and resubmitted amended plans. The amended consisted of the removal of the one storey set back element resulting in 5 full storeys, and the removal of the set back on the subservient element making this four storeys. These amendments have resulted in the loss of three apartments.

8.47 To support the amendments, the applicant has submitted an updated TVA. This demonstrates that B.05 would not be visible from Mill Road Bridge (originally part of a top storey was visible from this viewpoint). From Ainsworth Street the top storey would be visible. However, whilst it is still a large form, it would appear more discreet than the original design. The introduction of chimneys on the proposed Hooper Street terrace would not only better articulate the roof of the terrace but also help to screen the massing of the top storey. The proposed amendments to B.05 have addressed the Urban Design Officer's concern and B.05 is now acceptable in design terms.

Blocks B.06 and B.07 (4 storeys)

8.48 These blocks would be 15.2 metres in height and provide 15 apartments (mainly 1 and 2 bed) over four storeys. These blocks would be compliant with the building height parameter in the SPD. The design of the blocks would match blocks B.03 and B.04 albeit these are 5 storeys. These blocks would create the main edge to the railway boundary only punctuated by B.02 and B.05 which have been designed as the distinct blocks to help break up and provide interest to the railway edge. The roof tops of the railway blocks have been designed with discreet asymmetrical slanted roofs to conceal the lift overruns. These roof features would also introduce better articulation of the eastern elevation. From within the site the blocks would appear flat roofed but from the railway they would appear with a slanted roof between two cores. The design and scale of proposed blocks B.06 and B.07 are acceptable in design terms.

Block B.08 (3 storeys)

8.49 Block B.08 is proposed to be three storeys and would consist of maisonette apartments (no.6 maisonette apartments over the ground and first floor and no.4 apartments on the second floor). The block is compliant with the building height parameter in the SPD as it is located in the typically 2-3 storeys zone. The block would be 10.8 metres to the ridge and located behind the existing garage block at the northern end of the site. The block has been designed to appear as three pairs of blocks and with two distinct elevations (front and rear). The front elevation which facing over Eagle Park has been designed to appear as a row three storey gable fronted blocks with pitched roofs and recessed section delineating the entrances and terraces. The recessed sections are located between each pair of blocks. The rear elevation has been designed with slanted roofs which slope away to the central ridge line. Concerns were raised with the appearance of the rear elevation. Officers considered the rear elevation to appear squat due to the shallow proportions of the roof and three storey blocks. The applicant was therefore requested to amend the rear elevation by making the second floor appear within the roofscape and treated in a different material to reduce the massing, overcome the disproportionate scale of the roof and provide better articulation to the appearance of the elevation. The applicant submitted amended plans which took on board the suggested amendments. The concerns with the rear elevation have now been addressed and B.08 is now considered to be acceptable in design. The updated view of B.08 from Hooper Street in the TVA

(view 09) is of a much improved elevational design with a scale that is of a more domestic form.

Hooper Street terrace (H.48 to H.54 – 2 ½ storeys)

8.50 The Hooper Street terrace would be 9.3 metres to the ridge and located on the northern edge of the site to the east of the garage block and consist of six dwellings. Five of the dwellings (rooms in the roof) would be grouped as a terrace containing two and a half storey 3bed dwellings. The sixth dwelling (H.48) would be in the form of a detached dwelling which would be set slightly further back from the pavement and on the other side (west) of a new pedestrian access point into the site. The pedestrian access point would also be used for emergency vehicles but would contain three bollards to restrict access. To the rear of the terrace is Eagle Park which is an area of open space.

8.51 The Hooper Street terrace has been designed to respond to the residential/domestic context of Hooper Street, which is characterised by two storey terrace pitched roof dwellings on the back edge of the pavement. Whilst the general scale and form of the terrace units were considered acceptable, the Urban Design Officer raised concerns with the arrangement of the fenestration and lack of articulation at roof level. In response to this the applicant submitted amended plans which included pairing the doors to match the existing terrace houses and introduce chimneys into the roofscape. The applicant also introduced an additional dwelling to the eastern side of the terrace to compensate for the loss of 3 apartments in B.05. The alterations to the elevation and roof form are acceptable in design terms. The introduction of an additional matching dwelling to the terrace is also acceptable in design terms but would result in the loss of an existing silver birch tree. Whilst the loss of the tree is unfortunate, I do not consider the harm from its loss would outweigh the benefits of the proposed development. One silver birch tree would remain providing a termination to the end of the terrace when looking east along Hooper Street.

8.52 The applicant has also moved the detached unit slightly west to increase the width of the pedestrian access from 5 metres to just over 6 metres. Also a baywindow has been introduced into the front elevation to address the Urban Design Officer's concern with the modest appearance of the solitary dwelling. A chamfered edge has also been introduced to the end of terrace dwelling adjacent to the

pedestrian access point. These alterations have been assessed and are considered to be acceptable in design terms.

Eagle Green terrace (H.43 to H.47 – 2 and 3 storeys)

- 8.53 The Eagle Green terrace is made up of 3 no. two storey gable fronted terrace dwellings and a pair of semi-detached three storey town houses. The arrangement would be similar in design and scale to the Healdy Street terrace. Each dwelling would have access to the rear gardens via a passage from Kingston Mews and Eagle Foundry Street. The design and scale of the Eagle Green terrace is acceptable in terms of design and scale.
- 8.54 Overall, the proposed development is acceptable in terms of the design, scale and layout of the individual blocks within the site. Whilst there are deviations from the SPD guide, in my view these have been properly tested and justified in the appropriate manner. The applicant has applied a design led approach to the parameters in the SPD which has resulted in a refined scheme that has been amended to address Urban Design officer's concerns.
- 8.55 The application site does not include the entire Mill Road Depot site and the proposal to introduce 182 dwellings on a smaller site area has presented a challenge in terms of the provision of open space, the internal roads, car and cycle parking. However, it is important that any proposed development reflects and responds to the local character of the surrounding streets and scale of development in the locality apart where the SPD allows uplift in height. It is also important to acknowledge the railway context which has gradually been redefined by existing and recently approved developments. Recently, outline planning permission was granted for the redevelopment of the Ridgeons site which is diagonally opposite the depot site. The outline permission was for 245 dwellings which include a series of 5 and 6 storey apartment blocks as well as smaller buildings. To the north of the Ridgeons site are existing examples of tall apartment buildings which begins to characterised the railway context. The SPD acknowledges this by setting building height parameters on the eastern boundary of the site. Whilst the SPD sets these parameters, they are not prescriptive and it has been shown through a detailed design led process that an extra storey height on four of the six apartment block is acceptable in design terms and compatible with the site context.

8.56 In terms of how the increase in density impacts the site, the proposed development would provide 28% of the site area as open space which is above the range contained in the SPD. The internal roads are proposed to be adopted by the County Council and therefore will be maintained. The proposal includes sufficient car parking provision within a site located in a highly sustainable location and significant cycle parking is proposed over and above that required. Each of the dwellings would be provided with good size private gardens. The different typologies within the development serve different needs and requirements.

Impact on Conservation Area and other heritage assets

8.57 The Conservation Officer and Historic England have raised concerns with the proposed development. The Conservation Officer has concluded the impact from the proposed apartment would amount of substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and be contrary to paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Historic England welcomes the principle of redevelopment of the site but has concluded the impact from the proposals is likely to cause very serious harm of the significance of the Conservation Area as a result of views of apartment blocks in excess of four storeys from surrounding viewpoints and request the heights be reduced to conform to the SPD. The terminology is important and the NPPF provides guidance on how harm is to be assessed. Paragraph 132 states "*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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification*". Para 132 continues by stating, substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets (such as a Conservation Area) of the highest significance should be "wholly exceptional".

8.58 Para 133 goes on to state where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm the application should be refused unless it can demonstrated that the substantial harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefit that outweighs the harm. Para 134 states where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm, the harm should be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal. In order to determine whether the proposal causes substantial or less

than substantial harm it is important to assess the main deviations from the SPD that are considered to cause harm. I set out below my assessment of this in context with the Conservation Officer's comments.

- 8.59 The focus of concern from the Conservation officer and Historic England is the height of the proposed apartment blocks on the eastern boundary of the site adjacent to the railway line. In other respects the scheme is not considered to have a harmful effect on the Conservation Area or the setting of adjacent listed buildings.
- 8.60 I have set out the Conservation officers views in full in Appendix One. He uses planning policy and guidance to assess the impacts of the eastern apartment blocks on the Conservation Area. He argues amongst other things that there is no 'strategic' justification for buildings of the scale proposed, that the apartment blocks are contrary to the characteristics of the build environment in the Mill Road area and that the buildings would create a visual barrier dividing the halves of the conservation area whereas it is currently open. Historic England have expressed serious concerns about the impact on the Conservation Area.
- 8.61 The NPPF provides guidance on how harm is to be assessed. Paragraph 132 states "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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification". Para 132 continues by stating, substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets (such as a Conservation Area) of the highest significance should be "wholly exceptional".
- 8.62 Para 133 goes on to state where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm the application should be refused unless it can demonstrated that the substantial harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefit that outweighs the harm. Para 134 states where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm, the harm should be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal.
- 8.63 The view of conservation experts is clearly that the development will lead to 'substantial harm' and needs to be considered against

paragraph 133. This places a higher 'bar' in terms of the balance between impact on heritage assets and public benefit and requires the public benefits to be 'substantial'.

- 8.64 I have carefully considered the comments made by the Conservation Officer and whilst my view is that the impact on the conservation area is not 'substantial' I respect the views expressed as those of an expert in the assessment of 'harm'. My consideration of the 'weighted balance' is based on a starting point where harmful effects are significant and the public benefits need to be substantial to overcome them.
- 8.65 The applicant has produced a heritage statement which assesses the proposed development in context with the conservation area. The applicant has also produced a townscape visual assessment (TVA) in accordance with Policy 3/13 of the Local Plan (2006) which contains 21 views from immediate and wider locations. The most sensitive locations were agreed with Officers at the pre-application stage and fully rendered visualisations of the proposed development were produced from these views. As a result of the TVA, officers were able to properly assess the visual impact of the proposed development and request changes to refine and mitigate the impact where it was considered necessary.
- 8.66 In my view the SPD sets a baseline position in respect of building heights and development which is in accordance with the SPD should not be regarded as harmful to the Conservation Area in principle. However this does not mean that development which exceeds the heights set out in the SPD should not be supported in principle because it will harm the Conservation Area. It is fundamental to decision making in planning that both planning policy and material considerations are assessed.

Assessment of public benefits

- 8.67 The Council is committed to delivering new homes under the Devolution Deal however this is not a matter for decision makers on planning applications. However the need for new affordable housing in the City is acute and the delivery of 91 affordable homes is a significant public benefit. The affordable units would be made available for social rental which means rent rates no greater than the Local Housing Allowance which is equivalent to around 50% to 60% of market rental level. The affordable housing mix of 80% (74) 1 and 2 bed apartment and 20% (18) 2 and 3 bed house is acceptable to

the Growth Project Officer in the Housing Team as it is based upon up to date needs.

- 8.68 A further public benefit is that development of the site will remove a 'non-conforming' use and enable better integration between the existing housing to the north and the facilities in Mill Road to the south. The formation of areas of open space and footpaths within the site will benefit both new residents and existing residents. In particular the play area will be provide an opportunity for children to play away from the noise and traffic of Mill Road and quiet spaces will provide space for residents to get to know one another and benefit from the vibrant community spirit in the area.
- 8.69 The provision of land for the future provision of the Chisholm Trail is also a significant public benefit and will improve cycle access through this area to key transport modes and employment areas. There will be clauses in the s106 Agreement which will secure the Chisholm Trail.
- 8.70 In my opinion the public benefits arising from this highly sustainable development outweighs the impacts which have been identified as harmful to heritage assets.
- 8.71 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/11, 3/12, 4/11 and 4/10.

Public Art

- 8.72 No information has been provided about public art provision. However, the applicant is committed to provide some on site provision. I have therefore recommended a condition to require submission of a Public Art Strategy.
- 8.73 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1 and the Public Art SPD 2010

Renewable energy and sustainability

- 8.74 The proposed development includes a series of renewable energy and sustainability techniques to reduce carbon emission and to save energy in accordance with policy 8/16. The Sustainability Officer has reviewed the energy report and overheating assessment submitted with the application and supports the range of measures proposed such as PV panels, CHP, provision for electric vehicle

charging points, dedicated car club space amongst others.

8.75 In terms of renewable energy, the applicant has chosen photovoltaic panels as the preferred technology which would be located on the roofs of the apartment blocks and dwellings. The Energy report demonstrates that the PV panels would exceed the 10% reduction in carbon emissions target within policy 8/16. As such, this approach is supported and I have recommended the conditions that the officer has recommended

8.76 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16 and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Disabled access

8.77 Policy 5/9 (Housing for people with disabilities) states that housing developments of 15 or more dwellings will only be permitted if they provide housing with external design, layout and access suitable for occupation by people with disabilities. The amount should be 15% of market housing and 15% of affordable housing.

8.78 In terms of external design, the pathways to dwelling will be a minimum of 1.2 metres wide and the gardens designed to be no steeper 1:20. All communal entrance will be a minimum of 1.2 metres wide and all entrances will be signposted and lit. Canopies or recessed entrances will be provided for the apartment blocks and automated entrance lighting. All other entrance doors will have a minimum clear opening of 850mm and the thresholds for the main entrances will be level access.

8.79 15% of the residential units will be designed to be easily adapted for wheelchair users (M4(3) unit) – 28 units in total split between the private and affordable units (14 each – 25 apartments and 3 houses). All the affordable M4(3) units will be located on the ground floor. All the apartment blocks will contain lifts.

8.80 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.81 Concerns have been raised from local residents particularly those in Kingston Street regarding the proposed development on the western edge of the site in terms of overlooking, overshadowing/loss of light and overbearing/enclosure. I set out below my assessment of the potential impact of the proposed development on the residential amenity of the surrounding neighbours.

Overlooking

8.82 The nearest dwellings to the site are the dwellings in Kingston Street and Hooper Street. The most sensitive boundary is the west boundary which adjoins the rear gardens of the properties in Kingston Street. No windows are proposed at first floor level in the rear elevation of the mews terrace that would cause overlooking of the rear gardens of the Kingston Street dwellings. Block B.09 also does not contain any windows in the rear elevation. The windows in the side elevations of this block have been moved away from the rear boundary. The first and second floor windows in the north elevation have been made translucent and a privacy screen panel introduced to the first floor window in the south elevation. The other windows in the south elevation which are located closer to the front elevation are proposed to remain clear. Sections have been produced which demonstrate that the proposed three storey town houses would be screened by the two storey mews and so would not cause any overlooking impact. None of the other proposed buildings would cause any overlooking due to the levels of separation. Therefore, following the submission of amendments to Block B.09, I do not consider there would be any unreasonable levels overlooking on the residents in Kingston Street.

8.83 The proposed Hooper Street terrace would introduce front to front arrangement similar to that found within the surrounding streets. However, a first floor bedroom window serving H.54 would face the rear garden of 23 Ainsworth Street. The level of separation between the window and garden boundary wall of no.23 would be 24 metres and this would reflect similar relationships between existing properties in Hooper Street and Kingston Street with regards to overlooking. Therefore, in this tight urban context, the level of separation and similar existing relationship, I do not consider the window would cause significantly levels of overlooking such that it would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the neighbours.

8.84 The rear gardens of the dwellings in Great Eastern Street are located across the railway line from the site approx. 40 metres. Therefore, I do not consider the apartment blocks would cause any adverse levels of overlooking considering the level of separation.

Daylight and sunlight assessment

8.85 The applicant has submitted a daylight and sunlight assessment. The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the criteria and tests for assessing daylight and sunlight in the BRE guide. It is important to note here that the study, which is based upon BRE standards, is intended to be used as guidance only and the figures used flexibly. The assessment applied the Vertical Sky Component, No Sky Line, Annual Probable Sunlight Hours and Average Daylight Factor tests to calculate the impact on daylight and sunlight to existing properties.

8.86 As part of the daylight and sunlight analysis, 222 windows and 131 rooms within the neighbouring buildings were tested. 220 of the windows and 129 rooms satisfied the BRE guidelines. The windows that did not are contained in 21 and 22 Hooper Street and 22 and 24 Kingston Street. However the assessment demonstrates that the overall impact on these properties is minor. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development as amended would not have a significantly adverse impact on daylight and sunlight to the surrounding properties.

Overshadowing

8.87 The applicant has submitted an overshadowing impact assessment. 36 of the garden areas in Kingston Street were assessed of which 9 would see a minor reduction in sunlight but this reduction would be less than the 20% threshold set out in guidance (the highest % of reductions would be 11.4% and 8.7%). The assessment demonstrates that there would be no significant impact from overshadowing.

Overbearing/enclosure

8.88 The proposed mews terrace adjacent to the Kingston Street properties and Hooper Street terrace would be the closest proposed to existing relationship. I do not consider the other parts of the proposed development to cause any overbearing issues due to the levels of separation.

8.89 The existing coach house building forms the western boundary and rear boundary of the Kingston Street dwellings. The existing boundary wall is proposed to be reduced from its current height which ranges from approx. 6 metres for 73 metres of the two storey element before dropping down to 5.9 metres to the ridge at single storey. However, the proposed mews terrace would be set 3 metres from the boundary at a height of 5.9 metres. The distance between the rear elevation of the mews and the main rear elevation of the Kingston Street properties is circa. 30 metres (excluding any extensions). Therefore, in my view the mews terrace would not cause any additional levels of overbearing sense of enclosure on the residential amenity of these neighbouring properties.

8.90 B.09 has been amended following concerns raised by officers and local residents regarding its height and proximity to the boundary. The residents of Kingston Street triggered a Development Control Forum (DCF) to raise concern and request it to be reduced in height and set away from the boundary similar to the proposed mews terrace. The applicant agreed to make amendments to the building taking on board the concerns raised. Following the DCF the applicant submitted amended plans which remodeled B.09 from a flat roof building to a mono-pitched roof building with lower eaves on the rear elevation. The building was also pulled off the boundary by 2.2 metres. The eaves height on the rear elevation is proposed to be 6.5 metres with the roof sloping away from the boundary to a ridge height of 9.2 metres. The ridge has been pulled into the site by 7.2 metre creating an asymmetric roof. In my view, the proposed amendments would result in a less intrusive building which would not appear significantly overbearing over and above the existing two storey coach house. Therefore I do not consider the replacement building for the coach building would have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent occupiers.

8.91 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

8.92 The proposed dwellings have been designed to provide high quality living accommodation.

- 8.93 The proposed development would provide two main areas of open space within the site (excluding the Chisholm Trail) for local residents to access and use. These areas consist of Eagle Park at the northern end and the more formally arranged green space in Eagle Foundry Street Gardens which is centrally located. Each dwelling on the site would have access to either a private garden or terrace/balcony.
- 8.94 The total provision of open space on the site which includes the Chisholm Trail equates to 28% of the site area. This exceeds the SPD parameter for open space which requires 20%-25% of the site. The quantum of open space on the site would be 0.59 hectares which equates to 32sqm per dwelling.
- 8.95 In my opinion the proposal provides a high-quality living environment and an appropriate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Drainage

- 8.96 The proposed drainage strategy for surface water is for it to discharge into the existing public sewer. However, due to the levels of the existing surface water sewers the water will need to be pumped. Therefore a pumping station in the north-east corner of the site has been proposed. No precise details for the pump station have been provided and therefore this will need to be subject to condition. Also oversized drainage pipes will be located underneath the site roads. This is required in order for the pipes to be adopted by Anglian Water which means then the County Highway Authority will adopt the site roads.
- 8.97 The City Council's Drainage Officer and the Local Lead Flood Authority (County Council) objected to the proposed development on the basis the proposed pump system is the least sustainable drainage solution and should only be used as a last resort, and lack of lack of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). They also do not consider the drainage strategy has followed the drainage hierarchy which seeks infiltration drainage as the first option. An added complication to this is that the Environment Agency will only consider infiltration drainage acceptable if the applicant can demonstrate the land is uncontaminated in order to avoid infiltration drainage impacting groundwater. However, the Environmental Services team

have recommended conditions to ensure the entire site is investigated and remediated before any development is started.

8.98 The applicant argues the site has poor infiltration rates across the site and has agreed to carry out infiltration testing, as requested by the consultees, to demonstrate this. This has been done and both drainage teams were consulted. The drainage teams have advised that the infiltration rates are adequate enough to demonstrate is scope to incorporate infiltration drainage to be employed. The drainage teams have recommended soakaways be incorporated into the central band of development. This could potentially remove a significant volume of water from entering the pump station which would negate the use of the pump station in all but the most extreme events. The applicant is now seeking to submit an updated drainage strategy which I understand is to place less reliance on the pump system by incorporating more SuDS such as soakaways. However, this updated report was not received at the time of drafting this report and so I will update the amendment sheet with its findings and consultation comments from the drainage teams. I will recommend any conditions that the drainage teams requested in order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with agreed drainage strategy.

Refuse Arrangements

8.99 Each dwellinghouse and apartment block would be served by its own dedicated secure bin store integrated either within the footprint of the building or as a separate store. Access to the communal bin stores for refuse collection would be from the shared accesses on Eagle Foundry Street which provide direct access to the bin stores. The drag distance varies for each bin store but it is within the 25 metre guide limit of the RECAP Waste Design Guide.

8.100 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 3/12.

Highway Safety

8.101 The main highway issues raised by the County Council have been addressed. The proposal no longer includes sett paving and so this has overcome the Highway Authority's concerns with such features causing noise and vibration which would negate them adopting the highway. The forward visibility splays as requested are now

acceptable. The vehicular access ramp to the basement is proposed to a 1 in 10 slope rising to a 1 in 12 slope.

8.102 I am satisfied that the main highway engineer concerns have now been addressed. However, comments from the Transport Assessment Team have yet to be provided and so I will update the amendment sheet with their comments or report them orally at the committee.

8.103 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Car and Cycle Parking

Car parking

8.104 In total 151 car parking spaces are proposed on the site. 101 of these will be within the basement underneath the apartment blocks and accessed via Headly Street. Of the 151 spaces 120 are proposed to be for residents which equates to 0.65 spaces per dwelling. I set out below the breakdown in these spaces:

Location	Residents Spaces	Accessible Residents spaces	Spaces for others	Visitor spaces	Total
Basement	63	13	15	10	101
On plot/street	21				21
In garages	23				23
Visitor (on street)				6	6
Total	107	13	15	16	151

8.105 The basement will accommodate of 76 spaces for residents, 10 will be reserved for visitors and 15 for other uses (contractors, deliveries, care/support people etc..). The proposal includes the provision of one car club space which is proposed to be located on Eagle Foundry Street. Pedestrian access to the basement is proposed to be achieved either via two lifts; one in B.02 and one in B.05 or a shared cycle stair which is access via Headly Street or through B.02. The only vehicular access is via the ramp which is accessed of Headly Street. A traffic light system is proposed to be used to control

the flow of vehicles as the access ramp into the basement is proposed as a single lane.

8.106 Also, of the 101 car parking spaces within the basement 50% are proposed to be electrified charging spaces. 10 installed slow active electric charging spaces and 40 slow passive electric charging spaces with ducting and load capacity provided to meet future demands as and when it arises.

8.1027 Concerns have been raised by residents regarding the amount of car parking proposed on the site. Some have raised concerns with there being too much and some have raised concerns with there being not enough. These views reflect the need to strike a balance to meet the needs for future residents in this highly sustainable location and to address potential amenity impacts arising from on street parking in the wider area. In my view, the car parking numbers is about right for this site in this location. The Local Plan encourages a modal shift away from private car usage in locations within good access to public transport links and shops and services. The site is conveniently located in terms of proximity to bus stops, the railway station and city centre. The car parking also takes into consideration the need to provide spaces for visitors which is important. The proposed layout has been designed to try and mitigate rogue parking within the site. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed car parking provision is acceptable to meet the needs for future occupiers whilst also encouraging alternatives modes of transport with the over-provision for cycle spaces and a dedicated car club space.

Cycle parking

8.1038 The proposal includes 541 cycle parking spaces which is an overprovision for the scale of development proposed. Most of these would be located within the apartment blocks (176) and basement (150). 151 spaces are proposed for the houses. Access to the basement by cycle would be via a shared stair ramp or the two oversized cycle lifts in blocks B.02 and B.05. The cycle parking provision for the houses is proposed within the curtilage of each plot. The cycle provision for each size dwelling is compliant with the Cycle Parking Guide. 64 visitor cycle parking spaces are proposed which are spread around the site at specific convenient locations. This equates to 1 visitor space per 3 dwellings. The proposal also includes the provision for off-gauge cycles within the cycle stores for the apartments and there is sufficient space within the curtilages of the dwellings to accommodate such cycles.

8.109 In my view the proposed cycle parking provision in terms of amount, location, access and convenience is acceptable to meet the demands of future occupiers as well as those visiting the site.

8.110 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 8/6 and 8/10.

Third Party Representations

8.111 Whilst I have responded to the concerns raised in the third party representations in the above sections of the report, I set out below a brief response to the concerns raised:

Representations	Response
<i>Design, scale and layout</i>	
Building B.09 is unacceptable due to its design, height and proposal to use red brick within the Conservation Area;	The design of B.09 has been revised and the applicant has proposed to use buff brick.
B.09 would be out of scale and character with the existing houses in Kingston Street and contrary to the SPD;	See para 8.29 to 8.31
B.09 should be removed and the proposed two storey mews continued in its place;	As above.
Concerns with the proposal not following the guidance in the SPD in terms of number of dwellings (167 to 184) and increased storey heights (B.02, B.05 and B.09);	The deviations from the SPD parameters have been properly tested and justified through a design led approach.
Concerns with the amount/density of development on the site;	The amount of development is characteristic of the density housing of the surrounding streets and the impacts of this scale of development have been fully assessed.
The length of the two north-south street are out of character the local streets;	The proposed street pattern is an acceptable response to the surrounding streets.
The 5 storey blocks extending 40 metres into the site from the	None of the apartment blocks extend 40 metres into the site

<p>railway would appear out of character with the local urban grain;</p>	<p>from the railway line. The additional storey heights have been properly tested and justified.</p>
<p>The proposed layout does not offer encouragement to pedestrians to walk in or around this area;</p>	<p>The proposal would provide good permeability into and out of the site for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
<p>The contrast in between B.09 and B.02 is too great;</p>	<p>The relationships between blocks within the site have been fully tested and are considered appropriate.</p>
<p>6 storey buildings either side of the railway line (Ridgeons) will create an unusual and dark corridor;</p>	<p>The apartment blocks will create an edge of the railway line like other residential developments have done north of Ridgeons site. The scale of the railway land will mitigate any 'corridor' effect.</p>
<p>No mention of Free Library as part of the proposed development or its restoration and repair;</p>	<p>The Free Library is not part of this planning application. Its restoration and repair is the responsibility of the existing tenants and County Council.</p>
<p><i>Residential amenity</i></p>	
<p>Building B.09 would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the residents in Kingston Street in terms of overshadowing/loss of light, loss of privacy and enclosure;</p>	<p>See para 8.77 8.86</p>
<p>Concerns with the impact from the proposed ground floor uses in B.09 on residents in Kingston Street in terms of noise/disturbance, environmental;</p>	<p>The originally proposed A use classes have been removed. The proposal now seeks permission for B1 or D1 use within a more confined space away from the properties in Kingston Street.</p>
<p>Concerns with overlooking from the windows in the side of B.09;</p>	<p>See para 8.77 to 8.79</p>
<p>Concerns with the location of the proposed bins store for B.09 and the noise and odour impact</p>	<p>The proposed bin stores serving B.09 have been amended to be they are enclosed and accessed</p>

this would have on residents Kingston Street;	via secure gates.
Concerns with potential vermin infestation;	If such arising then this will be an issue for the Environmental Services team to manage.
Concerns with security if side access is not gated;	The side accesses are now gated.
No information showing the impact of overshadowing of residents in Great Eastern Street and Cavendish Road;	This is because the residents in these streets are a significant distance from the site and will not be affected by overshadowing.
Overlooking impact from the proposed apartment blocks on the gardens Great Eastern Street and Cavendish Road;	As above.
Impact from noise pollution on residents in Great Eastern Street from the barrier of buildings;	The Environmental Services Team has not raised any concerns in this regard and there are similar arrangements elsewhere along the railway line where this has not been an issue.
<i>Highways issues</i>	
Concerns with increase in traffic generation on Mill Road bridge – tunnel or cycle bridge across the site would benefit the local community;	The Highway Authority has not raised any concerns with highway safety arising from the proposed development at this junction subject to conditions and highway improvements.
The proposed parking provision is not adequate and will put additional pressure on surrounding streets;	See para 8.100 to 8.103
Concerns with the mode split estimates, distribution of trips onto highway, junction capacity issues, use of PICADY to assess capacity in the Transport Assessment;	The Transport Assessment Team are awaited.
Concerns with potential increase in accidents on Mill Road which is an existing accident cluster site;	The proposal includes highway improvements to improve visibility.

Site access should be redesigned and a pedestrian crossing with traffic lights installed to improve highway safety;	The Highway Authority has recommended highway improvements which the applicant will be making.
Residents of new development should not be entitled to participate in the residents parking scheme;	This is a County Council matter.
Residents parking scheme should be introduced to cover Hooper Street, Sturton Street and Ainsworth Street to prevent non-residents/commuter parking;	This is a County Council matter.
Concerns with the potential for the Hooper Street access to be used as a rat-run for motorcycles/mopeds;	3 bollards are proposed at the proposed Hooper Street junction to restrict motorcycles/mopeds.
In this sustainable location car parking should be reduced;	The car parking provision is 0.65 which is similar to the surrounding streets.
Too much car parking is proposed for this development – should be car free – provision of car parking increases cost of each dwelling by £15-20,000;	The proposed car parking is an appropriate balance between the location of the site and needs of future occupiers.
<i>Open space, landscaping etc...</i>	
Additional housing would place more pressure on open space which is limited in St Matthews area and YMCA will not provide an additional space;	28% of the site area is proposed to be open space which will be available to the surrounding to use.
Improvements to the overgrown weed infested planted area of Hooper Street should be proposed to provide attractive gateway into site;	I have recommended a soft and hard landscaping condition.
Concerns with the size of the gardens for the family houses;	The size of the gardens for the family houses are similar to other new developments. The Council does not have any specific space standards.
Access to the CT between the	The CT is a County Council

<p>dwellings is poor and will leave it underused and open to crime;</p>	<p>project for which a separate application will be made which will contain specific details about the appearance of the trail.</p>
<p>Play areas are too disjointed;</p>	<p>The play areas have been carefully design and laid out in accordance with officers advice.</p>
<p>Cycle parking should be greater and more accessible;</p>	<p>The proposal would provide 541 cycle parking spaces including sufficient visitor spacing. I am satisfied that the proposal provides enough spaces which are accessible to residents and visitors.</p>
<p>Concerned with the isolation of the CT – development turns it back on the CT and not conducive to encouraging full use of it, contrary to policy 3/7 and 8/5;</p>	<p>The CT is a County Council project for which a separate application will be made which will contain specific details about the appearance of the trail.</p>
<p>Concerns that the CT will turn into a long, dark, unwelcoming back alley;</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p>The development is impermeable to the CT route and concerned with the lack of information about the CT in the application;</p>	<p>Two of the internal links have been removed because they are not considered necessary and also could result in conflict with other cyclists/pedestrians from cyclists turning onto the CT from the site. The Headly Street access would provide a link into the site from the CT.</p>
<p>Concern with the removal of the intermediate links to the CT south of the Hooper Street access;</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p>Concerns the quality of the CT is being diluted;</p>	<p>Specific details for the CT will be brought forward by the County Council.</p>
<p>Concerns with the lack of consideration for ecology;</p>	<p>The Nature Conservation Officer has not raised any concerns and has recommended a bird box condition.</p>

Eagle Park should be located along the southern side of Hooper Street to make it inviting to local residents;	An access into the site has been created to invite local residents into the park. Relocating the proposed park to Hooper Street would detach the park from the future residents. The proposed approach achieves a good balance.
Concerns with access to the cycle lift in B.02 – doors are not wide enough should be 1.2 metres not 1.0 metre.	The doors to the cycle lift are acceptable and compliant with the Cycle Parking Guide.
Some provision for larger cycles such as adapted cycles and cargo cycles on the ground floor or accessible via the lift should be made;	The cycle cores within the apartment blocks have been made wide enough to accommodate cargo bikes.
<i>Other issues</i>	
Concerns with the increase in population on local services such as nurseries, schools, doctors and dentists;	See para 8.
The non-residential space for small businesses is supported;	Noted.
Concerns with the proposal for retail and food space on the site considering location of Mill Road shops;	This has now been removed from the proposal.
Retail use is not necessary on the site;	As above.
Concerns with no community centre provision – this should be provided;	The proposal includes the provision for the ground floor of B.09 to be used for community provision. The YMCA proposal is proposed to include a dedicated community facility.
Concerns with the loss of the Women's Resource Centre without any alternative site;	The WRC were given several alternative locations to move to. I understand they have been relocated.
Concerns with lack of community facilities and additionality that would result in the YMCA proposal;	The proposed community provision is to include a dedicated community facility which would be over and above

	the community provisions provided by the YMCA.
Concerns with the accuracy of the red line plan and ownership of the land – the application should be returned unprocessed to the applicant;	I have received confirmation from the applicant that the red line is correct and the landowner dispute has been determined in the applicant's favour by the Land Registry.
The brick pillar at the foot of the bridge is owned by Network Rail by they have not been notified and no details of the proposed remodelling of the foot of the bridge have been submitted;	Any removal of third land/infrastructure will require the approval of the landowner.
There must be a thorough site investigation for contaminants before any proposal to build;	This will be carried out prior to any development.
Any demolition or building work on the site using pile drivers could potentially lead to below ground contaminants being disturbed, leaking out into the groundwater;	Concerns noted.
Concerns with the potential increase in air pollution cause by engines running to leave/enter a one entrance site on to or off an already congested, heavily trafficked road;	Lower car parking and provision for electrified charging points will help to reduce pollution in the long term.
<i>Comments on amendments</i>	
Concerns with the impact from increased traffic generation;	The proposed traffic generation needs to be assessed in conjunction with the existing movements. The Transport Assessment Team comments are awaited.
The mews houses overlook and block light into the adjacent Kingston Street properties;	The mews terrace do not have any windows at first floor level in the rear elevation so would not cause any overlooking issues. The daylight and sunlight assessment has demonstrated that the proposal would not

	cause any significant levels of overshadowing.
Concerned with the loss of two silver birch trees (instead of one originally) and the impact on birds;	The loss of the silver birch does not outweigh the benefits of the overall proposal. Also, the proposal will include new tree planting.
Concerns with the reduction in the number of trees within the development;	The number of proposed trees is acceptable for this site.
Disappointed the revised plans have not addressed concerns raised about inclusion of a Women's Resource Centre;	The WRC has been relocated.
The revised plans do not address concerns with the height of the apartment blocks;	The additional height of the apartment blocks over the parameters has been carefully assessed and is considered to be acceptable in this location.
Concerns with the impact of car parking on the surrounding streets and air pollution associated with increased vehicle movements;	The site is located within a highly sustainable location in terms of proximity to the railway, local shops, city centre which are within walking distance. This would in my view limit the amount of vehicle movements necessary.
The revised B.09 is still three storey and has not overcome previous concerns;	B.09 has been modified in height, form and layout such that it would not cause significant harm to the residential amenity if the adjoining neighbours.
The dark grey brick for the mews houses is would not out of character;	Dark grey brick would add contrast to the surrounding the palette of materials.
Concerns with the quality of neighbourhood life if properties are rented out to short term tenants;	
Concerned with the future height of the rear wall serving the Kingston Street properties when buildings are demolished;	The minimum height of the boundary wall is proposed to 2 metres. The applicant has notified all the residents affected

	with a Party Wall Agreement.
--	------------------------------

Planning Obligations (s106 Agreement)

8.112 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 have introduced the requirement for all local authorities to make an assessment of any planning obligation in relation to three tests. Each planning obligation needs to pass three statutory tests to make sure that it is

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

In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements.

8.113 In line with the CIL Regulations, councils can pool no more than five S106 contributions towards the same project. The new ‘pooling’ restrictions were introduced from 6 April 2015 and relate to new S106 agreements. This means that all contributions now agreed by the city council must be for specific projects at particular locations, as opposed to generic infrastructure types within the city of Cambridge.

8.114 In bringing forward my recommendations in relation to the Planning Obligation for this development I have considered these requirements. The Planning Obligation Strategy (2010) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. The applicant has indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the Strategy. I have summarised the Heads of Terms below. Financial contributions would be calculated using formulae based on the final housing mix agreed through reserved matters.

Heads of Terms	Summary
City Council Infrastructure	
Informal open space	Onsite provision with shortfall to be provided through offsite contribution (see below)

Provision for children and teenagers	No contribution sought.
Indoor sports	£102,354 towards the provision and/or improvement of and/or access to, indoor sports facilities at the Abbey Pool.
Outdoor sports	£90,559 towards the improvement to and enhancement of the artificial grass pitch carpet (from sand to rubber crumb) at Coldham's Common.
Community facilities	£256,770 – towards providing/improving additional equipment and/or facilities as part of community meeting space on the Mill Road Depot site.
Affordable housing	50% provision on site. Tenure and dwelling type mix to be submitted for approval.
County Council – Education / Refuse	
Early years	£314,835 towards offsite provision – no project identified – triggers – 50% prior to commencement and 50% prior to occupation.
Primary School	£545,714 towards offsite provision – no project identified – triggers – 50% prior to commencement and 50% prior to occupation.
Secondary School	£475,524 – towards expansion and redevelopment of Chesterton Community College – triggers – 50% prior to commencement and 50% prior to occupation.
Life Long Learning (Libraries)	No contributions sought
Strategic waste	No contributions sought
Monitoring	£650
County Council – Transport	
Public highway	Delivery of site access improvement including works within the public highway.
Chisholm Trail	Proportionate contribution towards Chisholm Trail.

8.115 Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the above infrastructure provision, I am satisfied that the proposal

accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/8, 5/14 and 10/1 and the Planning Obligation Strategy 2010.

Affordable Housing

8.116 The development is required to make provision for affordable housing and I have assessed the proposals for affordable housing in paragraphs 8.13 to 8.18 above. The detail of the Affordable Housing Scheme can be secured through a Section 106 Agreement. Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Affordable Housing SPD (2008), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 5/5 and 10/1 and the Affordable Housing SPD (2008).

Planning Obligations Conclusion

8.117 It is my view that the planning obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development and therefore the Planning Obligation passes the tests set by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposal is for the redevelopment of the existing Mill Road Depot site for residential development consisting of 182 dwellings including 50% affordable housing, the provision of open space and the provision for the Chisholm Trail along the eastern boundary of the site. The proposal also includes a basement car park, cycle and bins storage and hard and soft landscaping.

9.2 The proposed development has had extensive pre-application consultation with variety of consultees prior to its submission. Nevertheless, the scheme has been amended post submission to address issues that were not satisfactorily resolved at the pre-application stage and to take on board local concerns.

9.3 The proposed development has been guided by the SPD for the site which is material consideration and is due to be adopted following the adoption of the emerging Local Plan (2014). The SPD contains several development parameters including site layout, building height, open space and transport and access. The proposed development is largely compliant with these parameters save for building height and open space. The building heights have been exceeded along the eastern boundary where the SPD recommended

typical building heights of 3-4 storeys and the potential for a 5 storey adjacent to the south-east corner. The proposed development following amendments to the proposal, now exceeds the building height on four of the six apartment blocks by a single storey. Concerns have been raised with the height of the apartment blocks along the eastern boundary in terms of their impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area which was considered to amount to substantial harm. In order to demonstrate the additional storeys would not cause substantial harm, a townscape and views assessment was submitted with the application and updated following revisions to reduce the height of B.05. I have carefully considered the balance between a harmful impact on the Conservation Area with the significant public benefits that would arise from the development. These amount to a significant number of affordable homes and provision of a sustainable, well connected development.

- 9.5 In terms of residential amenity, the proposed development has been carefully assessed to ensure it does not have a significantly detrimental impact on the adjoining and surrounding residents. I have concluded that there will be some degree of impact on residents of surrounding properties but the impact would not be significant.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to completion of the s106 Agreement, including identification of education projects to be delegated to officers, and the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) or investigations required to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

(a) Desk study to include:

-Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)

-General environmental setting.

-Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.

(b) A report setting out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

4. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 3, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

(a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors

(b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

5. Implementation of remediation.

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or each phase of the development where phased) the remediation strategy approved under clause (b) to condition 4 shall be fully implemented on site following the agreed schedule of works.

Reason: To ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

6. Completion report:

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to, and approved by the local planning authority.

(a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 4 and implemented under condition 5 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.

(b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13

7. Material Management Plan:

Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:

- a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
- b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
- c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
- d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development
- e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

All works will be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13.

8. Unexpected Contamination:

If unexpected contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development which has not previously been identified, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and the additional contamination has been fully assessed and remediation approved following steps (a) and (b) of condition 4 above. The approved remediation shall then be fully implemented under condition 5.

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13.

9. No construction work or demolition work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

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

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

11. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved (including any pre-construction, demolition, enabling works or piling), the applicant shall submit a report in writing, regarding the demolition / construction noise and vibration impact associated with this development, for approval by the local authority. The report shall be in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites and include full details of any piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and or vibration. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

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

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy4/13

13. Prior to installation of any external fixed, mechanical plant, a scheme for the insulation of said plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

The combined sound rating level of sound emitted from all fixed plant and/or machinery associated with the development at the use hereby approved shall not exceed the sound rating level limits specified within the Mott Macdonald 'Mill Road Depot, Cambridge Noise and Vibration impact assessment report dated 18th December 2017 (Document reference: 383347NS01 | 01 | D)'.

Reason: To protect the amenity of existing and future properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

14. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, details of an alternative ventilation scheme for the habitable rooms within blocks B2, B3, B4, B5, B6 and B7 on the east and south façades to negate / replace the need to open windows, in order to protect future occupiers from external traffic and railway noise shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The ventilation scheme shall achieve at least 2 air changes per hour. Full details are also required of the operating noise level of the alternative ventilation system.

The scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be fully retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants from high ambient noise levels in the area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

15. Prior to the commencement of development/construction, a noise insulation / attenuation scheme as appropriate, detailing the acoustic /noise insulation performance specification of the external building envelope of the residential units (having regard to the building fabric, glazing and ventilation) and other mitigation to reduce the level of noise experienced internally at the residential units as a result of high ambient noise levels in the area from road and rail shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall have regard to the external and internal noise levels recommended in British Standard 8233:2014 "Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings".

The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants from high ambient noise levels in the area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

16. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed ground-borne mitigation building design scheme demonstrating how the propagation of ground-borne vibration including reradiated vibration noise within blocks 2 - 7 is to be controlled to ensure that vibrations from railway traffic are not amplified between the foundations and the receiving rooms, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants from vibrations attributed to the use of the adjacent railway line (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

17. Prior to the commencement of above ground works to any units within blocks B2, B3, B4, B5, B6 and B7, on the east and south elevations, full details of the design and construction of the enclosed winter gardens located on the east and south elevations of said blocks, including the acoustic / noise insulation performance specification of the glazing, to reduce the level of noise experienced at the residential units as a result of high ambient noise levels in the area from road and rail shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The winter gardens shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained in situ thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of future occupants from high ambient noise levels in the area. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/13)

18. Prior to the installation of any artificial lighting, an artificial lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of any artificial lighting of the site and an artificial lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties shall be undertaken. Artificial lighting on and off site must meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - GN01:2011 (or as superseded) as detailed within the Mott Macdonald "Mill Road Development - Lighting Strategy" document dated 8th December 2017.

The approved lighting scheme shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details / measures.

Reason: In the interests of amenity. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/11 and 4/15)

19. The B1 or D1 use space on the ground floor of B.09 shall be open only between 08:00 and 23:00 Monday to Saturday and 09:00 and 18:00 Sunday and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To protect residential amenities and to accord with policy 4/13 of the Local Plan 2006.

20. Amplified music shall not be permitted on the ground floor of the B.09 building at any time.

Reason: To protect residential amenities and accord with policy 4/13 of the Local Plan 2006.

21. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, a scheme for the insulation of the ground floor of B.09 building in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the building hereby permitted is occupied and shall be thereafter retained as such.

Reason: To protect residential amenities and to accord with policy 4/13 of the Local Plan 2006.

22. Prior to occupation, further information shall be submitted and agreed in writing by the local planning authority in relation to the technical specification of the proposed gas fired Combined Heat and Power System, including emissions standards. Any gas fired CHP shall meet an emissions standard of:

Spark ignition engine: less than 150 mgNO_x/Nm³

Compression ignition engine: less than 400 mgNO_x/Nm³

Gas turbine: less than 50 mgNO_x/Nm³

Reason: To protect local air quality and human health by ensuring that the production of air pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter are kept to a minimum during the lifetime of the development, to contribute toward National Air Quality Objectives and accords with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policies 4/13 & 4/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

23. The industrial plant approved under Condition 22 shall be installed in accordance with the approved details before the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To protect local air quality and human health by ensuring that the production of air pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter are kept to a minimum during the lifetime of the development, to contribute toward National Air Quality Objectives and accords with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policies 4/13 & 4/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

24. The development hereby approved shall utilise low NO_x boilers, i.e., boilers that meet a dry NO_x emission rating of 40mg/kWh, to minimise emissions from the development that may impact on air quality. Details of the boilers shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval prior to installation.

A manufacturers NO_x emission test certificate or other evidence to demonstrate that every installed boiler meets the approved emissions standard shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The details shall demonstrate compliance with the agreed emissions limits. The scheme as approved shall be fully carried out in accordance with the approved details before first occupation and shall be thereafter retained.

Reason: To protect local air quality and human health by ensuring that the production of air pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter are kept to a minimum during the lifetime of the development, to contribute toward National Air Quality Objectives and accords with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policies 4/13 & 4/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

25. The electric vehicle charge points and associated infrastructure as detailed in and as shown on drawing numbers 17024_07_099 (Basement Plan) and 17024_07_109 (Houses) shall be installed prior to use of the development hereby permitted and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable forms of travel/transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 35 and Policy 4/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

26. The provision of an allocated car club car parking space and car club vehicle as detailed in the Air Quality Assessment (Ref: DM/JEB/P17-1283/02) shall be agreed prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging more sustainable forms of travel/transport and to reduce the impact of development on local air quality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 35 and Policy 4/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

27. The driveway hereby approved shall be constructed using a bound material for the first 6m from the back of the adopted public highway, to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway. Once constructed the driveway shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

28. The driveway hereby approved shall be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway. Once constructed the driveway shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: for the safe and effective operation of the highway in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

29. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed with the Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 8/2).

30. Prior to the commencement of the first use the vehicular access where it crosses the public highway shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Cambridgeshire County Council construction specification.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure satisfactory access into the site (Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006).

31. No development shall commence until details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as an Agreement has been entered into under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a Private Management and Maintenance Company has been established).

Reason: To ensure satisfactory development of the site and to ensure estate roads are managed and maintained thereafter to a suitable and safe standard.

32. The manoeuvring areas shall be provided as shown on the drawings and retained free of obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

33. The access shall be provided as shown on the approved drawings and a retained free of obstruction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

34. Development shall not commence until a construction management strategy for the demolition and construction phases has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a strategy shall include the details of cranes and other tall construction equipment (including the details of obstacle lighting). The approved strategy shall be implemented for the duration of the construction period.

Reason: To ensure that construction work and construction equipment on the site and adjoining land does not obstruct air traffic movements or otherwise impede the effective operation of air traffic navigation transmitter/receiver systems.

35. No development shall commence until a foul water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwellings shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the foul water strategy so approved unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To ensure appropriate foul water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/16)

36. No drainage works shall commence until a surface water management strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No hard-standing areas to be constructed until the works have been carried out in accordance with the surface water strategy so approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/16)

37. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines indicating lines, manholes, supports); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

38. No development shall take place until full details of Sustainable Urban Drainage/landscape features have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours, low flow channels, details showing method of inflow and outflow and detailed design of such features, sections showing details of lining, dimensions, construction, surface treatment, details of culverts, gulleys, rills etc. Details of softworks to drainage features. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure appropriate landscaping and surface water drainage. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/16)

39. No development shall take place until full details of the play areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include: location and general arrangement, levels, play equipment, surfacing, fencing, seating and other furniture, lighting and softworks. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable play area provision is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

40. A landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, other than small privately owned, domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing prior to occupation of the development or any phase of the development whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The landscape plan shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

41. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the building(s) is/are occupied and retained thereafter unless any variation is agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12)

42. Details of the specification and position of fencing, or any other measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of development, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, and implemented in accordance with that approval before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development (including demolition). The agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the retention of the trees on the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/11, 3/12 and 4/4)

43. Prior to the installation of any surface material except for access requirements, sample panels for all surfacing types shall be required to a minimum size of 1.0 x 1.0m complete with the correct laying patterns and jointing. The sample panel shall be retained on site during the course of the development unless otherwise agreed.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the paving. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/12).

44. Before starting any brick work, sample panels (minimum 1x1m) of the facing materials to be used shall be erected on site to establish the detail of bonding, coursing and colour, type of jointing shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The quality of finish and materials incorporated in any approved sample panel(s), which shall not be demolished prior to completion of development, shall be maintained throughout the development.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity and to ensure that the quality and colour of the detailing of the brickwork/stonework and jointing is acceptable and maintained throughout the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/12).

45. Full details of all non-masonry walling systems, cladding panels or other external screens including structural members, infill panels, edge, junction and coping details, colours, surface finishes/textures and relationships to glazing and roofing are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. This may consist of large-scale drawings and/or samples. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details unless the LPA agrees to any variation in writing.

Reason: To accord with Policy 3/4 and 3/12 of the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan

46. No demolition/development shall take place until an archaeological written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI which shall include:

A. the statement of significance and research objectives;

B. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;

C. The programme for post-excavation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate archaeological investigation of the site has been implemented before development commences. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/9)

47. Prior to first occupation, a scheme for the type and location of bird and bat boxes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To improve the bio-diversity contribution of the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/1).

48. The approved renewable and low carbon energy technologies shall be fully installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained and remain fully operational in accordance with a maintenance programme, which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

No review of this requirement on the basis of grid capacity issues can take place unless written evidence from the District Network Operator confirming the detail of grid capacity and its implications has been submitted to, and accepted in writing by, the local planning authority. Any subsequent amendment to the level of renewable/low carbon technologies provided on the site shall be in accordance with a revised scheme submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that the development does not give rise to unacceptable pollution. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/16).

49. Prior to the occupation of the first dwelling, a water efficiency specification for each dwelling type, based on the Water Efficiency Calculator Methodology or the Fitting Approach sets out in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition) shall be submitted to the local planning authority. This shall demonstrate that all dwellings are able to achieve a design standard of water use of no more than 110 litres/person/day and that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes efficient use of water and promotes the principles of sustainable construction (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/1 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Design & Construction' 2007).

50. Prior to the commencement of development (or in accordance with an alternative timetable otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority), with the exception of any works of demolition or below ground works, a Public Art Delivery Plan (PADP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and shall include the following:

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

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

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Cambridge City Council Public Art SPD (2010) and policies 3/4 and 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

51. The development shall not be brought into use until a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants has been implemented in accordance with a scheme that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

In the interests of residential safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/7).

52. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, the highway works associated with the S278 highways work shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: for the safe and effective operation of the highway in accordance with Policy 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

53. No development shall commence until details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed street trees within the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The street trees shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details unless local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by the proper maintenance of existing and/or new landscape features. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/11)

INFORMATIVE: The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling should be carried out by a suitably qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured sampling, analysis methodology and relevant guidance. The Council has produced a guidance document to provide information to developers on how to deal with contaminated land. The document, 'Contaminated Land in Cambridge- Developers Guide' can be downloaded from the City Council website on <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/land-pollution>.

Hard copies can also be provided upon request

INFORMATIVE: Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance.

INFORMATIVE: Any material imported into the site shall be tested for a full suite of contaminants including metals and petroleum hydrocarbons prior to importation. Material imported for landscaping should be tested at a frequency of 1 sample every 20m³ or one per lorry load, whichever is greater. Material imported for other purposes can be tested at a lower frequency (justification and prior approval for the adopted rate is required by the Local Authority). If the material originates from a clean source the developer should contact the Environmental Quality Growth Team for further advice.

INFORMATIVE: The Council's document 'Developers Guide to Contaminated Land in Cambridge' provides further details on the responsibilities of the developers and the information required to assess potentially contaminated sites. It can be found at the City Council's website on <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/land-pollution>
Hard copies can also be provided upon request.

INFORMATIVE: Demolition/Construction noise/vibration report

The noise and vibration report should include:

- a) An assessment of the significance of the noise impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Annex E - Significance of noise effects. It is recommended that the ABC method detailed in E.3.2 be used unless works are likely to continue longer than a month then the 2-5 dB (A) change method should be used.
- b) An assessment of the significance of the vibration impact due to the demolition/construction works and suitable methods for this are to be found in BS 5228:2009 Part 2 Annex B - Significance of vibration effects.

If piling is to be undertaken then full details of the proposed method to be used is required and this should be included in the noise and vibration reports detailed above.

Following the production of the above reports a monitoring protocol should be proposed for agreement with the Local Planning Authority. It will be expected that as a minimum spot checks to be undertaken on a regular basis at site boundaries nearest noise sensitive premises and longer term monitoring to be undertaken when:-

- Agreed target levels are likely to exceeded
- Upon the receipt of substantiated complaints
- At the request of the Local Planning Authority / Environmental Health following any justified complaints.

Guidance on noise monitoring is given in BS 5228:2009 Part 1 Section 8.4 - Noise Control Targets and in Annex G - noise monitoring.

A procedure for seeking approval from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in circumstances when demolition/construction works need to be carried out at time outside the permitted hours. This should incorporate a minimum notice period of 10 working days to the Local Planning Authority and 5 working days to neighbours to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider the application as necessary. For emergencies the Local Planning Authority should be notified but where this is not possible the Council's Out of Hours Noise service should be notified on 0300 303 3839.

Contact details for monitoring personnel, site manager including out of hours emergency telephone number should be provided.

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

To satisfy the condition requiring the submission of a program of measures to control airborne dust above, the applicant should have regard to:

-Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction

http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

- Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites 2012

http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf

-Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition - supplementary planning guidance

https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Dust%20and%20Emissions%20SPG%208%20July%202014_0.pdf

INFORMATIVE: The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:

i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)

- ii. Contractor parking, for both phases (wherever possible all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street).
- iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (wherever possible all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
- iv. Control of dust, mud and debris, please note it is an offence under the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or debris onto the adopted public highway.

INFORMATIVE: This development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a public right of way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council.

INFORMATIVE: No part of any structure may overhang or encroach under or upon the public highway unless licensed by the Highway Authority and no gate / door / ground floor window shall open outwards over the public highway.

INFORMATIVE: Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, the cost of which must be borne by the applicant.

INFORMATIVE: The developer is advised that part of the proposed structure may support future public highway. Prior to commencement the developer must contact the Highway Authority to provide an Approval In Principle document in accordance with BD2 Volume 1 Highway Structures: Approval Procedures and General Design, Section 1 Approval Procedures of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.

Appendix Two – Comments from Urban Design and Conservation

Conservation Officer comments

1st comments:

The proposed development is unacceptable and should be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The scale, design and prominence of the proposed eastern blocks within the site fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the of the conservation area contrary to 2006 Local Plan policy 4/11 Conservation Areas.*
- 2. The proposals detract from the conservation area and its setting contrary to policy 3/13 Tall Buildings.*
- 3. The proposal for a number of 5-6 storey blocks fails to demonstrate that it has a positive impact on the setting in terms of location on the site, height, scale and form, materials, wider townscape and available views and is therefore contrary to policy 3/12 “The Design of New Buildings”.*

Summary

As the site is within a conservation area therefore the LPA has a statutory duty *to pay special attention to preserving or enhancing the conservation area when determining the planning applications.*

The Mill Road Depot SPD acknowledged that “it is vital that detailed proposals respond to the wider context established in the Mill Road Conservation Area.” This reflects Local Plan policy 4/11 which requires that the design of any new building preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Mill Road area has special character but the proposed scheme is not “of Mill Road”.

Few buildings in the Mill Road area reach even four storeys and then only as isolated instances punctuating the prevalent 2-3 storey townscape. However, the application includes bulky blocks of five and six storey height. Buildings of this nature in the position proposed will seriously harm the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Local Plan policy requires the five and six storey blocks are treated as *tall buildings* in policy terms. Under this policy, “new buildings which are significantly taller than their neighbour” will only be permitted if they will not detract from conservation areas and their settings.

The NPPF para 132 advises that when considering the impacts on a designated heritage asset (eg conservation area), *great weight* should be given to its conservation. It further advises that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to the conservation area, *consent should be refused unless there are substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.*

It has not been demonstrated that the current scheme is the most sensitive of a range of designs or different orientations, that minimises harm and delivers public benefits in the most sustainable and appropriate way.

Background.

The Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas Act

S72 is a general duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.

In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any [Planning functions or provisions] ***special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.***

Local Plan 2006

3/12 The Design of New Buildings

New buildings will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that they: a. *have a positive impact on their setting in terms of location on the site, height, scale and form, materials, detailing, wider townscape and landscape impacts and available views;*

3/13 Tall Buildings and the Skyline

New buildings which are significantly taller than their neighbours and/or roof-top plant or other features on existing buildings, will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that they **will not detract from: a,b,c,d. Conservation Areas and their settings;**

4/11 Conservation Areas

Development within, or which affect the setting of or impact on views into and out of conservation areas, will only be permitted if: a... b. *the design of any new building* or the alteration of an existing one *preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area* by faithfully reflecting its context or providing a successful contrast with it; c....

Local Plan Review

Policy 60: Tall buildings

“Any proposals that are considered tall, that is significantly taller than the

buildings that surround them and/or exceed 19m within the historic core (see

Section Three, on the City Centre) or 13m outside it, will be considered

against the following criteria”

- a. location, setting and context
- b. historical impact
- c. scale, massing and architectural quality
- d. amenity and microclimate
- e. public realm

Appendix F notes that

“F.4 Cambridge has not experienced pressure for exceptionally tall structures as in

larger cities such as London, Birmingham and Manchester. However, it does face

pressure for ***buildings that are taller than the prevailing built form across the city at between five and ten residential storeys. Given the relatively modest scale of buildings in Cambridge, this increased height has the potential to impact on both the immediate and wider skyline.***”

NPPF

131. In determining planning 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;

- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to

sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

132. *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.*
133. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.....
134. 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 securing its optimum viable use.

Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief SPD

In its “***Vision & Key Principles***” the SPD states (3.1):

“The design will ***respect the typical form, scale and character of buildings and streets in the Mill Road Conservation Area***, exploiting opportunities to incorporate taller buildings up to four storeys adjacent to the railway at the eastern boundary of the site.....”

4.6.7 A range of building heights should be provided across the site to create visual interest and character (see figure 42). ***It is vital that detailed proposals respond to the wider context established in the Mill Road Conservation Area.***

4.6.8 In broad terms, typical building heights are likely to follow a distinct east-west pattern across the site. The westerly line of building frontages, potentially involving the retained coach house-style buildings, proposed for refurbishment form **a tight two storey edge at the western boundary** of the site adjacent to private gardens to the rear of properties on Kingston Street. Buildings in the **centre of the site will typically involve 2-3 storeys** depending on the exact house types proposed. At the eastern edge of the site, it is proposed that **the apartment buildings increase up to 4 storeys**. Façades of any apartment building will need to be broken down to avoid the appearance of a long, horizontal edge to the railway line. **A taller buildings, e.g. maximum of 5 storeys, could be** appropriate at the south eastern edge of the site.

Discussion.

The Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area.

A conservation area is “an area of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance”.

The Mill Road area is a contrast to other parts of central Cambridge. According to the conservation area appraisal, the Mill Road area is a well-detailed and well-preserved Victorian suburb - *this is its special interest or significance*. To usefully assess context, the appraisal necessarily addresses the Mill Road area as a discrete entity (within the Cambridge central conservation area). Physical characteristics include the character of the 2-3 storey houses and the linear streets. Houses on pavement edge or with narrow front garden, Brick timber and slate, pitched roofs, on street parking, open space as set pieces (eg Mill Road Cemetery, Romsey Recreation Ground, Ditchburn Place).

Character is not only about physical appearance - the character of a place is a group of qualities. The Mill Road area is celebrated for its particular retail character, its strong sense of identity, its winter fair. It is a demonstrably “different” part of Cambridge.

According to Wikipedia for instance, “It runs southeast from near to Parker's Piece, at the junction with Gonville Place, East Road, and Parkside. It crosses the main railway line and links to the city's ring road (the A1134). It passes through the wards of Petersfield and Romsey, which are divided by the railway line. It is a busy, cosmopolitan street home to many independent businesses, churches, a Hindu temple and a mosque.”

The railway line (though not actually within the designated area) is important to the setting of the conservation area and is a recognised feature associated with it both visually and historically.

The railway bridge allows wide views of the surroundings. Chimneys and the roofs of terraced streets can be seen. Nothing is taller than the top the building running parallel with the old library. The chimneys of the locally listed houses next to the bridge feature. At some distance, the cluster of taller buildings can be seen marking the railway station cb1 area. Views sideways from the top being parapeted, are had from buses but the approaches either side are open and pedestrians travelling from the west can see into the site

obliquely once past the old library and Regent buildings, and from the east can view the railway side of the site.

Mill Road Conservation Area Appraisal & the Depot.

1.2 (page 2). **“Overall, the Conservation Area provides an example of a well-detailed and well-preserved Victorian suburb with only a few examples of modern infill.”** At page 3, “A large City Council Depot off Mill Road is surprisingly discreet.” Further, the appraisal townscape analysis maps include a Negative Buildings notation (one such building is marked west of Kingston Street), this notation is not used on the Depot site however. In other words, visually the Depot neither reinforces nor detracts from the key characteristics of the CA. The Depot can therefore be said to have a neutral presence.

In terms of heritage value (four types of value identified by HE in eg “Managing Significance in Decision Taking” GPA2 HE. Enhancement 32.”Sites in conservation areas that could add to the character and value of the area”), it has a degree of “communal” or “historic” value (eg the Eagle Foundry originally on the site was one of the earliest (c. 1845-1859) features of the Victorian development of Mill Road) as distinct from “aesthetic” or “evidential” values for its industrial then later, Corporation depot use. The Depot’s 1905 gatehouse with its inscription to the City Corporation, provides a tangible connection with the site’s use.

Setting – NPPG para 013

“The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each.

“The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. This will vary over time and according to circumstance.”

This is important for understanding the railway role as a contributor to the setting of the conservation area at Mill Road. Also, the historic relationship between places – referred to in the NPPG extract, is relevant to the schemes impact from Gt Eastern Street. That “buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each” (ref first para of above extract). The row of tall blocks has impacts in these terms – it creates separation between the two halves of the conservation area.

As tall buildings, the apartment blocks are not in locations the Local Plan Review (Submission version Apndx F .31) regards as those where tall buildings could potentially, have positive impacts, eg local nodes, key city street junctions, ends of important vistas, or in/around principal transport junctions. The situation is very different to that at CB1, the railway station area where “tall buildings” have been considered appropriate.

Beyond creating a transition of scale across the site, there is no “strategic” justification for buildings of scale in the position proposed – they are not an arrival point (like the station) or a significant node nor marking an entrance to the city.

The submitted views, demonstrate that the buildings will be visible from a number of points:
mainly from Mill Road bridge – in context with the railway line;
Ainsworth Street – in context with the two storey Victorian terrace housing; and
Gywdir Street – in context with the roofscape of the dwellings in Kingston Street.

Views across the railway form an aspect of the setting of the Romsey side of the area. The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. From either side, the existing character is of openness and small scale elements.

The appearance of the apartment block element of the scheme is contrary to the characteristics of built development in the Mill Road area. The scale and extent of the blocks introduces a form that would be different in the area. Different can be a successful contrast but in this particular case is not judged to be positive or to *enhance* the conservation area. It would not mark a building of significant function (eg church, community centre, warehouse etc). A visual

barrier would be erected dividing the halves of the conservation area whereas it is currently open. The choice of proposed external materials (and steel) may reflect instances of use of red or grey brick in the conservation area but their use over the sheer surfaces of 5-6 storeys apartment blocks would amplify the building's scale.

As a result of the choices made in the design of the site, overall, the proposed scheme does not reflect Mill Road area - it has the appearance of a scheme for a periphery growth areas or new settlement.

The scheme has the appearance of a periphery growth area or a new settlement.

Setting of the Listed Building. The red line boundary of the full Planning application excludes the Mill Road frontage, the entrance lodge, Listed former library etc. In terms of the setting of the Listed former library, any change due to the current application affects its wider rather than its immediate setting. I do not consider any benefit to its setting to arise from the current application.

The level of Harm.

Application proposals should recognise, minimise, and justify any harm to the conservation area.

Issues that have previously been identified as part of the conservation area appraisal included "the protection of views into, out of and across the conservation area" (page 4).

That the SPD acknowledged a need for special justification for even four storeys, implies that this taller scheme necessitates a yet greater level of harm and greater degree of justification.

The extra height of the proposals cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset (conservation area). Submitted view 08 shows the taller building visible over the roof of houses at Gwydir Street car park; verified view 12 Ainsworth Street, shows the harmful effect of the top two storeys of one of the taller blocks as does 13 - even as background elements, the blocks at 5-6 storeys would have an incongruous presence in the conservation area which would be reduced in buildings of less height. From the east in view 02, the extra height takes the blocks higher than the tree that otherwise provide some screening. However, the fixed views submitted do not adequately describe the impact on wider views appreciated as a

person *moves* across the bridge – a key vantage point in the conservation area.

Mill Road railway bridge is one of the reference points (F.22) specifically highlighted in the Local Plan Review Tall Buildings appendix. Also, an important positive view from the railway bridge north is denoted on the CA appraisal townscape analysis map. The applicant's statement that the proposed apartment blocks, would have "no impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in views from the east side of Mill Road bridge", fails to recognise that the apartment blocks would feature not simply from the one or two static views represented in the submitted views. In reality, views here are not limited to one angle or direction. The scale and openness of the area can be seen in a sweep around the bridge or its approach from the east.

Rather than introducing one taller building at a point indicated in the SPD, the application introduces a run of buildings above 4 storeys. The site - currently "discreet", would become *prominent* due to the scale and design of the apartment blocks, and in a manner that would not reinforce the significance of the conservation area nor preserve its character or appearance.

The appearance of the development would work against perception of the fundamental significance of the Mill Road area – as an area of homogeneous character; the Romsey and Petersfield parts joined not separated by the railway, and as an area that contrasts with the city centre.

Because of the crucial location of the tall blocks next to the railway; their scale (beyond the SPD) and presence as a result of 5-6 storeys; the challenge they would signal to the fundamental character of the area; and the sensitivity of the conservation area already having been raised as an issue in the appraisal, their impact should be regarded as creating substantial harm in terms of NPPF para 133.

The level of harm has not been clearly and convincingly justified as required by NPPF Para. 132 ('As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.'). as being for example, "the most sensitive of a range of designs or different orientations, that minimises harm and delivers public benefits in the most sustainable and appropriate way".

Paragraph 4.6.9. of the SPD acknowledged that although few buildings in the conservation area reach four storeys ***an exception for a 4 storey apartment block could be made*** on the grounds of : a positive context for investment; separation and screening from the nearby streets; seeking highest design quality and avoidance of long horizontal facades ie *it was necessary to invoke exceptional circumstances*. To now seek to justify scale even further beyond that in the SPD, therefore carries the implication that additional harm has to be justified.

The limited justification for moving from the original brief/SPD in the submitted D&A Statement simply states (page 28):

The first of these are imperatives that remain subject to detail on a case by case basis. Regarding the last, it is unclear how the special character of Mill Road area was taken into account in the comparison with other sites in Cambridge or whether these sites are comparable in terms of constraints.

With reference to the NPPG (019) it has not been demonstrated that in the context of harm to the conservation area, the current proposals (rather than alternative development options) will minimise that harm and “will deliver public benefits in the most sustainable and appropriate way”.

2nd comments – following submission on amended plans and additional information:

It is considered that there are no material Conservation issues with the amendments/additional material submitted for this application.

Urban Design

1st comments:

The proposed development is unacceptable and should be refused for the following reasons:

- *Block B.05: The overall scale is considered to be excessively tall for the location on the site and creates an overly bulky form that is harmful in key views looking south from Ainsworth Street in the Conservation Area. As such the proposals fail to meet Policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).*

- *Building B.09: The flat roof form and use of red brick across an entirely blank and unrelieved western elevation combine to create a building that will be overbearing in scale against the finer grain terraces of Kingston Street. As such the proposals fail to meet Policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).*

The Urban Design comments will be limited to the design of the proposals in terms of the approach to scale and massing, quality of public and private amenity spaces and the overall architectural approach taken by the proposals. Our comments will assess compliance and departure of the proposals with the Mill Road Depot Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) of June 2016.

Draft Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document (March 2017);

The compliance with the SPD parameters is considered in detail under the relevant headings in these comments. In summary however, the scheme is consistent with the Transport & Access parameter and Uses parameter. There is a significant departure in terms of the overall scale and massing identified in the Building heights and types parameter in terms of the overall height of buildings along the eastern side of the site adjacent to the railway. The amount of open space falls below that identified in the SPD.

Townscape and Views Assessment (December 2017)

A comprehensive 'Townscape and Views Assessment (December 2017)' has been submitted to satisfy Policy 3/13. This assessment has reviewed 21 views from publically accessible locations around the site taking in key vantage points, longer range views as well as more local views.

The views considered to be most sensitive have been provided as full rendered visualisations and are limited to Mill Road Bridge (View 02), Hooper Street/Kingston Street junction (View 09) and Ainsworth Street (View 12).

We largely support the conclusions of the assessment in terms of the assessment of the overall visibility of the scheme. However we are unconvinced by the conclusions reached to the assessment of the impact of the proposals from Ainsworth Street captured in Viewpoint 12 (verified view – fully rendered visualisation) and Viewpoint 13 (verified view – building outlines). The overall height of

Building B.05 is clearly visible above the prevailing and proposed built form and in our opinion appears incongruous against the prevailing character of the Conservation Area.

Response to context;

The development site is relatively discrete with limited viewpoints from publically accessible areas in the nearby and wider Conservation Area. The overall approach to the likely acceptable development form is contained within the Development Parameters that combine to form the overall development framework for the site.

Conservation colleagues will be providing detailed comments regarding the acceptability of the proposals in terms of impact on the Conservation Area. However we have suggested some more detailed changes to particular elevations on Hooper Street, to the overall height of Building B.05 and form of B.09 elsewhere in these comments that we believe are needed to create an overall form of development that is more appropriate to the prevailing context.

Movement and Access

The SPD establishes the Transport and Access framework for the site as well as safeguarding the alignment for the Chisholm Trail along the eastern boundary.

The proposed layout in the submitted application creates the north-south links established in the SPD framework but omits the proposed secondary east-west link shown in Figure 28 of the SPD. An emergency vehicle access is proposed via the pedestrian/cycle link connecting into Hooper Street.

Overall the network of pedestrian, cycle and motor vehicle routes creates a permeable and well-connected grid that is consistent with the SPD and the established alignment of routes found in this part of the Mill Road Conservation Area.

The proposals safeguard the route for the Chisholm Trail that runs along the eastern boundary of the site and facilitates the connection into the wider on-street network.

Layout

The Transport and Access framework helps to establish the overall layout of the development reflecting the predominantly north-south

orientation of surrounding residential streets in the Mill Road Conservation Area. The layout provides two areas of open space to serve the development and wider area. The overall layout is largely consistent with the SPD.

Scale and massing

The SPD established the overall approach to the acceptable scale and massing on the development site. Lower development against the western boundary with the Kingston Street properties is shown in Figure 42: Building Heights of the SPD with taller development along the eastern side of the site adjacent to the existing railway line. The SPD also identified a location for a taller 5 storey building to the south-eastern section of site.

The proposals are compliant with the SPD in that they follow the overall massing strategy identified in Figure 42. However the proposed scheme departs from the massing strategy in four key areas.

- **Building B.02** occupies the area identified in the SPD as an ‘opportunity for taller development’ which in Paragraph 4.6.7 states ‘A taller building, e.g. maximum of 5 storeys, could be appropriate at the south eastern edge of the site’. Building B.02 is proposed at 6 storeys which exceeds the SPD guidance by one storey. This part of the site is considered to be the least sensitive in terms of proximity to existing residential development. The additional height, when assessed from the submitted viewpoints, is not considered to be harmful in overall urban design terms although colleagues will be making detailed comments with regards to the overall impact on the Conservation Area. The overall increase does not impact on the quality of amenity spaces provided on the development.
- The overall height of the apartment blocks **Buildings B.03 and B.04** along the eastern boundary exceeds the SPD guidance by a single storey. Building B.07 exceeds the SPD guidance by 1-2 storeys. The additional height, when assessed from the submitted viewpoints, is not considered to be harmful in overall urban design terms although Conservation colleagues will be making detailed comments with regards to the overall impact on the Conservation Area.

- **Building B.05** - Viewpoints 12 and 13 demonstrates the negative impact of the increased scale of the development in views looking south from Ainsworth Street whereby the bulk of Building B.05 is visually intrusive above the proposed Hooper Street terrace and incongruous in the overall finer grain and articulated roofscape of this section of the Conservation Area. Suggestions for amendments to this Building are made elsewhere in these comments.
- **Building B.09** against the western boundary is proposed at 3 storeys. The 3 storey form is proposed to close down the view when looking north from the Mill Road entrance to the site and is considered to be successful in this regard. However the overall height and form of the building in close proximity to the boundary of the Kingston Street properties is considered problematic. The flat roof form and use of red brick across an entirely blank and unrelieved western elevation combine to create a building that will be overbearing in scale against the finer grain terraces of Kingston Street. A more articulated form (possibly to read at 2.5 storeys with accommodation in the pitched roof roofspace) that is moved further away from the boundary would create a more successful relationship with the existing dwellings to the west.

Daylight and sunlight assessments

The applicant has submitted a 'Sun hours on ground assessment' prepared by GIA for all of the Public Open Spaces on the development. This assessment reveals that all of these spaces pass and exceed the minimum BRE guidance.

The GIA 'Daylight & Sunlight – overshadowing impacts assessments (14th December 2017)' has assessed the impact of the proposals on private amenity spaces to the east of the site. Existing Units 1 & 2 see the most impact but we are suggesting a revised approach to the scale and massing elsewhere in these comments that will improve this relationship. The conclusion to this assessment is that all properties meet the minimum criteria identified in the BRE guidance (including units 1 & 2) and a number of units will see an improvement over their current situation given the increased setback of the proposed 'mews' houses.

Open Space and Landscape

Figure 33 Open Space in the SPD establishes the distribution of open space on the Mill Road Depot site. The SPD establishes that the site (2.7Ha) could accommodate between 20 and 25% of open space including the land safeguarded for the Chisholm Trail. It recognised that it would not be possible for the site to accommodate open space to meet the full Council Open Space standards whilst delivering the indicated 167 units.

The scheme proposes an increased number of units (184) on a smaller site area (2.15Ha). The DAS (page 122) identifies the Landscape Strategy which identifies 'green open spaces'. The approximate area of each of these spaces is shown below:

- Eagle Park: 269.37m²
- Eagle Foundry Street Gardens: 1213.97m²
- Area to the east of 'The Limes': 297.44m²
- Total open space area: 4200.78m² or 0.42Ha

This equates to 19.5% (excluding the area identified for the Chisholm Trail) of the site being public open space. This is close to the minimum amount of open area space indicated in the SPD.

Paragraph 4.4.10 of the SPD highlights the importance of undertaking shadow studies to 'demonstrate that the public open space receives a reasonable amount of sunlight'. The GIA study referred to earlier in these comments demonstrates that the proposed spaces meet and exceed the minimum BRE guidelines.

The need for a clear management plan for the areas of public realm and landscape/open space will help to mitigate potential concerns around the intensity of use of these spaces by future residents. It is also worth noting that all units benefit from outdoor private amenity spaces and all 'family houses' have gardens.

Landscape colleagues will be providing detailed comments regarding the landscape proposals. The one key area that we would highlight, that relates to the functional design of the parking provided for the townhouses (H.23-H.32) that front onto Eagle Foundry Street, is the potential for overrun of the proposed landscaped areas by vehicles attempting to manoeuvre into the parking spaces (see drawing: MMD-367749-C-DR-01-XX-1125). These need to be adjusted and a tracking diagram provided to demonstrate that they work.

Elevations and Materials

The overall approach to the elevational design within the scheme is supported in urban design terms along with the chosen palette of materials. However there are a number of changes that need to be made in order to create a development that sits more comfortably into the surrounding established context. These changes are described in more detail below.

Building typologies

Houses - Hooper Street elevation (Units H48, 49, 50, 51, 52 & 53)

- Unit H48 needs to be 'grander in appearance' respond to the context whereby individual houses are often set back with a bay window and more fancy dentil course.
- H49, H50, H51, H52, H53 – these would be better paired (i.e. front doors adjacent) to respond to the character and configuration of the row/terrace houses in the locale.
- Both H48 and H49 are very blank at ground floor where they face onto the pedestrian/cycle route. Introducing a bay to the ground floor would increase surveillance of the route.
- Vertical division of the windows is uncharacteristic of the area. Horizontally divided windows should be proposed.
- The ridge creates a long and continuous line which is uncharacteristic of the area. This should be broken and vent cowls/chimneys (as used at Trumpington Meadows) could be used to achieve this finer grain articulation.
- The overall ridge height needs to be reduced. As proposed it currently exceeds the existing terraced properties in the foreground diminishing the sense of perspective.

Apartments - Unit B.02

Further clarification of the ramp arrangements into the basement level car parking is required. The ramp appears to start beyond the envelope of the building with in the public realm creating a level change between the footpath and carriageway. Such an arrangement makes the ramp unduly intrusive and our strong preference would be for it to start at the building line.

Unit B.05

This block is the most visible from the Conservation Area and appears incongruous with the established fine grain of Ainsworth Street when viewed from Viewpoint 12 and 13 in the Townscape and Views Assessment.

The overall height needs to be down to reduce the impact from these key views. A more recessive/perforate approach to the upper floors would help to reduce the bulk of the building.

There is also an issue with height of parapet to conceal lift overrun. Duplex units should be considered (as at CB1 Block L1) to remove the need for lift overrun and allow for a lower parapet again helping to reduce the overall height of the block.

Unit B.08

We are concerned about the rear elevation when viewed from Hooper Street (see submitted Viewpoint 9). The overall height combined with the hipped roof form is overly bulky when viewed across the garages. This elevation needs to be visually reduced in scale to create the appearance of upper floor rooms in the roofspace and the rear projections detailed to read as subservient to the main 'Eagle Park' facing frontage block.

Unit B.09

As described previously in these comments, the overall height and form of the building in close proximity to the boundary of the Kingston Street properties is considered problematic. The flat roof form and use of red brick across an entirely blank and unrelieved western elevation combine to create a building that will be overbearing in scale against the finer grain terraces of Kingston Street. A more articulated form (possibly to read at 2.5 storeys with accommodation in the pitched roof roofspace) that is moved further away from the boundary would create a more successful relationship with the existing dwellings to the west.

2nd comments – following review of amended plans and additional information:

The proposed development has addressed the main concerns raised in the original consultation comments and is acceptable subject to condition.

Block B.05

The amendments have removed the top floor of the block to create a 5 storey building with the height of the eastern section reduced further to remove it from the view looking south down Ainsworth

Street. The result is a building that sits more comfortably in this view. Whilst of a larger format form, it is now much less prominent in the view and combined with the proposed terraced houses on Hooper Street with their more articulated roofscape that help to screen the massing of Block B.05, the form is now considered acceptable in design terms.

Building B.09

The view into the Depot Site from Mill Road is important in terms of connecting the new development back to the existing. There is also an important relationship between the building closing this view and the retained Gatehouse and Library. As such an increase in the overall scale of this building was considered appropriate as the scheme was discussed at the pre-application stage. However, whilst supporting the principle of a more prominent building to terminate the view from the Mill Road entrance, the building as submitted was considered to have an overbearing impact on existing neighbouring properties on Kingston Street due to a combination of the overall height and boxy form.

The building has been comprehensively redesigned to address these concerns. The 'gabled' form still allows for the needed height to terminate the view but creates a much more articulated appearance. The pitched roof results in a diminishing plane when viewed from existing properties on Kingston Street and in combination with the retained boundary wall effectively responds to the context. Overall the changes are considered to be acceptable in design terms.

Building B.08

The upper floor rear elevation of these units has been changed to pull the proposed roofing material down to create a more subservient appearance of 'rooms in the roof'. Whilst the overall roof form and massing is unchanged we consider that the changes do satisfactorily address our previous concerns and that the proposed units will be less prominent than the previous iteration where the brickwork extended for a full three storeys.

Hooper Street elevations

Doors are now 'paired', as per existing terraced houses in the Conservation Area and chimney 'cows' have been added to

accommodate the MVHR extract and provide a secondary finer grain articulation to the roofscape. These changes are considered acceptable in design terms.

An additional unit is proposed to the east of the 'row' with an angled east elevation. The additional unit is considered acceptable in design terms and makes better use of the available land.

The detached dwelling to the west of the pedestrian/cycle link has had a number of changes made to it to respond to our previous concerns. These changes are considered acceptable in design terms.

Tracking Diagram - car parking spaces on Eagle Foundry Street

The revised tracking diagram provided by Mott MacDonald (drawing number MMD-367749-C-DR-01-XX-1125 Rev P2) is the same as the one previously submitted with the application. Based on this information it is apparent that no changes have been made. However Landscape Colleagues have been in discussion with the applicant's Landscape Architect regarding this issue and associated concerns regarding the proposed trees along this frontage. A revised approach that looks at both the hard and soft landscaping is needed. This revised approach will improve the tracking/manoeuvrability into the car parking spaces.

Revised access ramp arrangement

The ramp to the basement has been redesigned to reduce the impact on the public realm by relocating the start of the ramp approximately 10 metres further east than the previously proposed position. As such it now sits much more within the perceived threshold of the building and is considered acceptable in design terms.

**Cambridge City
Council
Design & Conservation
Panel**

**Notes of the meeting Wednesday 6th
September 2017**

Attendees:

David Grech	Co-opted member (formerly Historic England and
Acting Chair) Mark Richards	RIBA
Russell Davies	RTPI
Stacey Weiser	Cambridge Past, Present & Future
Ian Steen	Co-opted member (retired
architect) Robert Myers	Landscape
Institute	
Jon Harris	Co-opted member (architectural historian)
Tony Nix	RICS

Officers:

Sav Patel City Council
Sarah Dyer City Council
Jonathan Brookes City Council
Christian Brady City Council
Jonathan Hurst City Council
Niamh Lenihan City Council

Apologies – Di Haigh and Chris Davis

1. Presentation – Draft development proposals - Mill Road Depot

Pre-application presentation of draft development proposals for the City Council Depot site

on Mill Road. A Draft Supplementary Planning Document has been approved by the Council

(copy attached) and the design team, led by Allies and Morrison, is preparing a full Planning application for the site for submission later in the year. This is an opportunity to see and comment on the current proposals which are still being developed with active involvement of Council officers and will be subject to further public consultation.

The client for the project is the Cambridge Investment Partnership - a joint venture between Cambridge City Council and Hill Investment Partnerships. CIP has been formed to develop sites to meet the need for housing, and in particular affordable housing in Cambridge.

The application will seek to deliver around 220 homes, of which 50% will be affordable, in a mix of houses and apartments.

Presentation by Bob Allies, Max Kettenacker and Oliver Unwin of Allies & Morrison Architects accompanied by Andy Thompson of Beacon Planning and representatives from the Cambridge Investment Partnership.

The Panel's comments were as follows:

- **Overall Approach.**

The Panel were supportive of the overall approach adopted in the design, with an orthogonal area of low-rise housing that responded to the strong north-south grid evident in the adjacent Victorian terraces. Meanwhile, the blocks of flats to the east are splayed to relate to the railway, and the low-rise housing fronting onto Hooper Street again respects the existing alignment of that street. The open spaces are then used to reconcile the differing alignments.

- **History.**

The Panel also welcomes the retention of the gatehouse and, along with the suggested street names, would encourage the inclusion of other historic references on site such as cast iron street furniture to acknowledge the former iron foundry on the site, and possibly incorporating into the children's play area an appropriately robust, child-sized replica of the Eagle locomotive.

- **Density.**

The SPD prepared for this site sets out a capacity of 167 dwellings at a density of 62 dwellings per hectare (dph), which reflects the 60 to 65 dph of the adjacent Victorian terraces. The current proposal represents a significant departure from the SPD, proposing 219 dwellings at a density of 86 dph. This was a key concern among the Panel who, although aware of the City Council's need to increase social housing provision, questioned the appropriateness of this density, which would require buildings of a scale and form that would be alien to the predominant character and appearance of the conservation area. Such an increase in density would also have implications for car parking and open space within the site, and increase pressure on the single point of access.

The Panel appreciated that the increased density would enable a significant additional number of affordable houses to be delivered (approximately 26), but the Panel were unclear as to whether the consequences of such an increase in density, including the adverse impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, had been fully understood and accepted by the Council as a whole; or if the departure from the SPD only reflected the aspirations of that section of the Council directly involved in CIP.

- **Views.**

The Panel were shown the (unverified) results of the views assessment which suggests that the development would have either little or no visual impact when seen from most key views in the surrounding area. The tallest element would be clearly visible from Ainsworth Street to the north, and the taller blocks along the railway would again be clearly visible both from the bridge and the railway. However, since the whole site lies within the conservation area, the design team are reminded that the impact of these taller buildings, and how they are experienced from within the site, should also be part of any consideration of impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area.

- **Apartment blocks facing the railway line.**

While the Panel did not object to the principle of locating the taller elements parallel with the railway (and indeed acknowledged that they would afford a degree of acoustic shading to the low rise housing to the west), concern was expressed as to their overall scale and form, and the quality of the spaces between these blocks. The acoustic impact on the houses to the east, as a result of reflected noise from the railway, may also be an issue, and the Panel would welcome the opportunity to review the results of acoustic modelling work in due course. The Panel also recommended that the over-simplistic roofline facing the railway should be reviewed, and consideration should be given to utilising these roofs for external amenity space for the residents, which might also alleviate some of the pressure on the green spaces at ground level.

- **Relationship with Chisholm Trail.**

The Panel would wish to emphasise the need to deliver an active frontage onto the Chisholm Trail, but at the same time noted the need to respect the privacy of the residents in the ground floor units. The Panel therefore recommended a more considered approach to ground levels across the site, allowing the ground level to be stepped up in the open spaces to the west of the flats, and thereby enabling the level of the ground floor units to be lifted above the level of the Chisholm Trail. This could result in a more positive treatment along the frontage with the Chisholm Trail, for the benefit of both residents and cyclists. A consequence of this might also be to reduce the excavations required for the underground carpark, and a corresponding reduction in the amount of soil to be removed from site.

- **Middle block (7 storeys)**

The Panel were particularly uncomfortable with what appears as a sudden change of architectural treatment from the low-rise dwellings

to the tallest elements on the site, and had grave concerns over the top two stories on the 7 storey block.

- **Mill Park.**

The Panel were advised that the current proposal delivers 28% open space, slightly in excess of the 25% set out in the SPD. However, the Panel noted that the current proposal also includes an additional 52 dwellings over the figure set out in the SPD, and that the resulting additional number of residents would mean less open space per resident compared to that envisaged in the SPD. The Panel therefore questioned, in general terms, whether the amount of open space provision was adequate for a site of the density now proposed.

The park is likely to come under heavy pressure and, in order to avoid the issues of noise and anti-social behaviour that have been experienced at the similarly sized park within CB1; consideration should be given to limiting the activities that might take place in this space. It should be seen more as a peaceful garden space, with trees and play equipment, and not a space to kick a football around in. Consideration might therefore be given to planting more trees than currently proposed, to help control the use of the space.

The Panel also expressed some concern that the largest blocks are sited to the south of the main open spaces, which is likely to result in problems of overshadowing. It is understood that a shading study has been undertaken, and the Panel would welcome the opportunity to review the findings to better understand how sunlight would penetrate these open spaces at different times of the day and year.

- **Trees.**

The recognition of the importance of the trees within the site is supported by the Panel. However, some concern was expressed over the relationship between the basement carpark and the trees that are to be planted along the east side of Eagle Foundry Walk as the proximity of the basement would result in some trees being unable to spread their roots to the east. The use of tree pits to accommodate two trees facing onto the Chisholm Trail was also noted, and these would require careful consideration to ensure the trees can flourish.

- **Garden spaces.**

Concern was expressed that a number of north facing gardens were significantly shorter than the south facing gardens. Further consideration should be given to making these gardens longer, possibly by relocating the bin store areas from the front of the houses, so as to reduce the problem of overshadowing. Some concern was also expressed over the

small yard' spaces on the 2 bed houses on the west side of Kingston Mews, but it was accepted that this replicated a solution that has already been successfully adopted elsewhere. However, the Panel felt that this house type would not be suitable for social housing.

- **Renewables.**

The Panel note that discussions on the use of renewable energy are only at a preliminary stage, but would like to encourage the proposal for a CHP system, along with some careful siting of photovoltaic panels on roofs. However, the use of PV panels should not be seen to prevent the use of the roofs over the flats for amenity space, and it might be possible to incorporate PV panels onto shelters within such amenity areas. Any use of PV panels should be integral to the design, and not be seen as a subsequent 'add-on'.

- **Community Building.**

The Panel noted that the community building has been relocated from the SPD so as to create a visual stop at the end of the entrance road. Whilst acknowledging that this may not be a good location for a private dwelling, the Panel asked that more consideration be given to the possible uses of this building, and whether it may need some secure external space (e.g. to enable it to be used for a nursery).

- **Materials.**

The design team are encouraged to consider broadening their palette of materials to achieve a more distinctive result.

- **Shared surface areas.**

The Panel welcomed the treatment of the 'raised table' area around the retained gatehouse building, and would encourage the use of shared surfaces to be extended throughout the site, along with the exclusion of tarmac, to create a more pleasant environment. Consideration might also be given to making Kingston Mews one-way (heading south).

Conclusion.

The Panel were broadly comfortable with the approach applied to the overall layout and location of the housing and vehicular circulation. However, the departure from the SPD and the resulting scale and massing of the higher elements, together with their impact on the open space and the wider Conservation Area were issues of particular concern.

Since a development of this density will be inconsistent with the existing character and appearance of the Conservation Area, there is a need to weigh the resulting harm against the public benefit of

the social housing provision, and whether such harm is justified. The Panel will leave such questions for the Planning Committee Members to consider.

The Panel concluded it would be inappropriate to vote on the proposals at this stage, but would like to re-visit the scheme at a future meeting following a firmer steer from City Council Members and officers on the issue of density, and once the design has been developed further.

2. Notes of the last meeting Wednesday 12th July 2017.
Notes agreed.

3. Date of next meeting Wednesday 11th October 2017.

Reminder

CABE 'traffic light' definitions:

GREEN: a good scheme, or one that is acceptable subject to minor improvements

AMBER: in need of *significant* improvements to make it acceptable, but not a matter of starting from scratch

RED: the scheme is fundamentally flawed and a fresh start is needed.

**Cambridge City Council
Design & Conservation
Panel**

**Notes of the meeting Wednesday 14th
February 2018**

Attendees:

David Grech	(retired architect, formerly Historic England) Acting Chair
Zoe Skelding	RIBA
Russell Davies	RTPI (retired)
Ian Steen	retired architect, co-opted member
Robert Myers	Landscape Institute
Stacey Weiser	Cambridge Past Present & Future
Tony Nix	RICS

Officers:

Jonathan Brookes
Jonathan Hurst
Council Sav Patel

Observers:

Cllr Martin Smart City
Ffion Jones City
Hannah Walker City
Lorraine King East Cambs District Council
Rebecca Saunt East Cambs District Council

Apologies – Di Haigh and Jon Harris

1. Presentation – Mill Road Depot, Mill Road (17/2245/FUL)

The erection of 184 dwellings (including 50% affordable housing), 72sqm of floor-space consisting of Use Class A1 (Shop), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Food and Drinks) or D1 (Non-Residential Institutions) - in the alternative, basement car park (101 spaces), surface water pumping station, open space (including play area), alterations to the junction with Mill Road, together with associated external works including cycle parking and landscaping.

This was last seen by the Panel at pre-application stage in September 2017 when a total of

220 dwellings were proposed (a vote was not cast at that meeting). Other work since then has included sunlight and acoustic analysis as well as further assessment work on views and development of the landscaping.

The site area has been reduced, with a YMCA building now proposed for the south east corner of the site, but that does not form part of the current application.

Presentation by Bob Allies and Max Kettenacker with Oliver Unwin of Allies & Morrison Architects accompanied by Andy Thompson of Beacon Planning, David Digby of Cambridge Investment Partnership and Steve McCoy of TEP (landscaping).

The Panel's comments were as follows:

The Panel noted and welcomed much of the work that had taken place to refine the project since they last saw it in September 2017. Many of the Panel's comments concerning landscaping, north-facing gardens, materials and the profiles to the blocks facing the railway had been specifically addressed in the revised site layout and elevational treatments. However, while there had also been some reduction in heights to some of the blocks alongside the railway, the Panel's previous concern over the departure from the development density set out in the SPD remained. In response to questions on this, Bob Allies accepted that the taller elements within the scheme represented a departure from the existing character and appearance of the conservation area, but questioned whether it was right that a pre-existing character should so influence the future evolution of our cities, and prevent a brownfield site from being re-developed to its full potential.

- **The departure from the SPD.**

Much of the Panels consideration of the project focused on this aspect since, in attempting to achieve a higher quantum of development on the site to that permitted in the SPD, the resulting scheme is almost bound to have a negative impact on the prevailing character and appearance of the Mill Road Conservation Area. The SPD sets out an overall density of 62 dwellings per hectare for this site, which is consistent with the density found in the adjacent streets of predominantly two-storey terraced housing. The density now proposed for the site is significantly higher, at approximately 82 dph. The SPD also allows for taller buildings to be placed alongside the railway, with a maximum height of 4-stories, plus one 5-storey block at the southern end. While the scheme now submitted for planning permission includes two SPD compliant 4-storey blocks alongside the railway at the northern end of the site

(Buildings B06 and B07), it also includes a 6-storey block (Building B05) near the centre of the eastern boundary, plus two 5-storey blocks alongside the railway in the southern half of the site (Buildings B03 and B04), and a 6-storey block at the southern end (Building B02). The Panel concluded that these departures from the SPD would result in a degree of harm to the conservation area, but it was then necessary to consider whether that harm was justified by the wider public benefits that the scheme would deliver through the provision of 92 affordable dwellings.

- **Degree of ‘harm’ to the Mill Road Conservation Area.**

The Panel noted the Conservation Officer’s view that this scheme would result in ‘substantial harm’ to the character and appearance of the Mill Road Conservation Area as described within the terms of the NPPF. The Panel further noted that the Government’s Planning Practice Guidance identifies ‘substantial harm’ as a high test. In this instance, when considering the degree of visibility of the taller elements in relation to the overall size of the Mill Road Conservation Area, the Panel concluded that, while the level of harm may be high (e.g. in views along Ainsworth Street), the overall impact is unlikely to cross the threshold of ‘substantial harm’. Two members of the Panel considered the level of harm was justified by the degree of public benefit that would be delivered, while others concluded that the level of harm was not outweighed by the public benefits. Some voiced deep concern over what they considered to be overdevelopment within a Conservation Area, and the worrying precedent that this might set. Whilst the Panel could not reach an overall consensus on this issue, there was broad agreement that the most harmful element in the scheme is Building B05, and that the harm to the Conservation Area might be significantly reduced if this block was to be reduced from 6-storeys down to 4-storeys. There was less concern over the impact of Building B02, and in particular its impact in views from Mill Road Bridge, though many in the Panel had concerns over the impact of this building on views within the site, and in particular the view looking east along Headley Street (where the building is seen to dwarf the adjacent 2 and 3-storey houses). It was again noted that the whole site lies within the Mill Road Conservation Area and the views within the site are also pertinent to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as a whole.

- **The gateway building (B09)**

The Panel were sympathetic to the views of residents regarding the impact of a three storey building in such close proximity to the western boundary of the site and the gardens to the existing dwellings along Kingston Street. The Panel therefore welcomed the decision by the design team to review this building and revise the proposal in order to reduce the impact on the neighbouring gardens.

- **Landscaping.**

The Panel welcomed the development of the landscaping proposals. The additional detail for the tree pits appears, in principle, convincing, although their proximity to the underground car parking will mean they are likely to require to be irrigated if they are to succeed. The opening up of Eagle Park through the re-siting of Building B08 is a significant enhancement, but it was felt that the location of the play area could have an adverse impact on this space.

Whilst there was an acknowledgement that this was the most practical location, its intrusive nature would be compounded by the need to fence the play area. The design of this area might benefit from further consideration, and in particular whether the northern corner of the play area might be cut back. The use of swales and the grass bank are welcome additions that encourage play; and the footpath between the Green and Park has the potential to become an important informal social space within the development.

- **The Chisholm Trail corridor.**

The Panel noted that the Chisholm Trail corridor is included within the open space calculation of the site as a whole, whereas the roads and pavements are excluded from this calculation. The Panel therefore questioned the logic in including the Chisholm Trail, but accepted that the corridor has also been included within the open space calculations set out in the SPD. In the event that the Chisholm Trail is not routed through the site (e.g. should it be re-routed east of the railway) then the Panel would expect this corridor to remain as amenity space for the enjoyment of the residents. The Panel also noted that the Chisholm Trail is likely to be used by cyclists travelling at speed, and the treatment of the trail at the northern end of the site, where it passes the pumping station and meets the road, will need careful consideration.

- **Renewables – PV.**

As most of the roofs on the site have an East-West orientation, the Panel questioned the effectiveness of PV for much of the development. The Panel were advised that many of the roof pitches are relatively shallow and there would only be a modest reduction in efficiency of the panels on these roofs.

- **Car parking.**

The Panel noted that the overall parking ratio had been reduced in response to feedback from the pre-application consultation exercise. The Panel identified the need for strict management of the on-street visitor parking provision, as 'fly parking' would have a significant detrimental impact on the quality of the public realm. The Panel also expressed some concern over the suggestion that some of the underground parking spaces may be allocated to the YMCA development, compounding a concern that the YMCA proposal did not form part of the current application.

- **Gatehouse and YMCA building (separate application).**

The Panel were disappointed that the application was not a single, holistic proposal for the site, and that the Gatehouse and YMCA building would now form a separate application, since this made it difficult to assess both the full impact of the development and the extent of public benefits that would be delivered. The Panel also had concerns as to what might happen if the YMCA did not relocate to this site. While ongoing negotiations with the YMCA appear encouraging, it was the Panel's view that, should these not come to fruition, then this part of the site should be made available for additional social housing (mirroring the 50% ratio that is to be delivered on the rest of the site).

Conclusion.

The challenge being faced by the design team to deliver new homes on a large scale and within this sensitive location is understood. Despite the obvious public benefits of both removing a current blight on the Conservation Area and the provision of significant numbers of affordable housing, the Panel must express its reservations. How a Conservation Area evolves in order to provide new homes on a brownfield site is the fundamental issue at the heart of this scheme.

VERDICT – GREEN (2), AMBER (5) with 1 abstention.

(As Cambridge PPF have already submitted comments on this proposal Stacey Weiser did not participate in the vote.)

2. Notes of the last meeting – Wednesday 13th December 2017
Notes agreed.

3. Date of next meeting – Wednesday 14th March 2018

Reminder

CABE 'traffic light' definitions:

GREEN: a good scheme, or one that is acceptable subject to minor improvements

AMBER: in need of *significant* improvements to make it acceptable, but not a matter of starting from scratch

RED: the scheme is fundamentally flawed and a fresh start is needed.

