

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee

7th November 2007

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Corporate Manager - Planning and Sustainable Communities

S/1496/07/RM - IMPINGTON

**Erection of 154 Room Hotel with Ancillary Bar/Restaurant,
Car Parking (Decked and Surface) and Access,
at Land at Arbury Camp, Kings Hedges Road, Impington.**

Recommendation: Approval

Date for Determination: 7 November 2007

Notes:

This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the Parish Council have raised objections to the application.

Site and Proposal

1. The 0.52 Ha application site forms part of the larger development area known as Arbury Camp approved under planning application S/2379/01/O. As Members will be aware the approved redevelopment of the Arbury site is of a mixed-use development comprising residential, employment, retail, leisure, social/community uses, open space, educational facilities and associated transport infrastructure. Works on a number of the housing sites with approved reserved matters are currently under construction, the base infrastructure across the site has also been provided and the primary school opened in September this year.
2. This current application seeks planning permission for a 154 bed hotel and is a resubmission following the committee members' decision to refuse planning permission for a hotel at the Planning Committee on 10 January 2007. The refused application proposed a 137 bed hotel with 98 parking spaces in the form of surface spaces around the site. Although the officer recommendation was for the approval of this scheme, members of the committee voted to refuse planning permission for this earlier application for the following reasons:
 1. The proposal by virtue of its design, form and scale is regarded as poor and inappropriate for such a prominent position located adjacent to the A14. Policy CNF1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 provides for a Masterplan that seeks the retention of an attractive edge to Cambridge through the use of high standards of design and landscaping and the creation of gateway features. The emerging Arbury Design Guide (9th March 2006) sets out guiding design principles to deliver a 'vision of quality and distinctiveness for the development'. The application fails to provide the required standard of design on this prominent site on the edge of Cambridge. It does not form a quality landmark building as required by the emerging Arbury Camp Design Guide. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policy CNF1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, the Arbury Camp Development Framework Plan approved as part of the outline consent dated 14th June 2005 and as

revised under plan number JJG025/DFP2/100 Rev.A on 15 February 2006, Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Government advice in PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' especially paragraphs 33 and 34.

2. Policy TP1 and Appendix 7/1 thereto of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 seeks to ensure that all new developments provide adequate off-street parking to accommodate the needs they generate. While the Council's adopted standards are maximum standards, the proposal still fails to provide sufficient accommodation within the curtilage of the site to provide the required level of parking essential and incidental to the use of the site with the result that parking will be encouraged to take place on the surrounding highway and adjoining private car parks to the detriment of the amenities of residents and the character of the area. The application therefore fails to comply with the requirements of Policies TP1 and RT1 (7) of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.
3. The application site is located in the northern part of the Arbury Camp development area with the immediate northern boundary formed by the A14 and its associated embankment. The southern boundary is marked by land parcel E1, which has reserved matters approval for 31 affordable residential units in two 4 storey high blocks under S/1417/06/RM and currently is at an advanced stage of build. To the east the boundary is un-marked but will form part of the commercial area of the site while to the west the boundary is marked by the infrastructure serving the application site and the electricity sub-station.
4. The current application proposes a five-storey building backing onto the A14 to act as a noise buffer for the adjacent residential development. The design of the hotel is essentially linear with a kink in the centre created by a full height stairwell and service area with a second kink on the opposite end of the building over the decked car park. The building will have an overall length of 98.5 metres, a maximum width of 23 metres, with a roof height of 15.5 metres increasing to a maximum height of 18.5 metres to the top of the stairwell. In terms of materials and appearance the building would comprise forticrete fair faced blockwork on the ground floor, self-coloured cream rendering on the first to fourth floors with off white rendering and slatted larch panels at high and low levels. Doors and windows will be polyester powder coated double glazed aluminium coloured mouse grey (RAL7005) with the use of aluminium curtain walling to the stair tower, central circulation areas and the top floors. The roof area is flat but with the top floor being slightly set back from the other floors and using aluminium curtain walling will give the appearance of a 'floating' roof. On the fourth floor level the roof area over the third floor would be extensively planted with Sedum.
5. In terms of parking the current proposal allocates 135 spaces within the site. The parking will be in the form of 65 surface spaces, which includes 8 located under the hotel building while the remaining 70 parking spaces are provided in the form of a 1 ½ storey decked parking structure over which the hotel building will project. The parking spaces within the decked structure will be screened by vertical wooden slats, which would allow landscaping to grow over to soften the appearance of the structure.

Planning History

6. **S/2379/01/O** - Outline consent for residential, employment, retail, leisure, social/community uses, open space, education facilities and associated transport infrastructure.

7. **S/2298/03/F** - Approval of strategic infrastructure comprising spine roads and footpaths, cycle ways, surface water drainage, foul water drainage and strategic services.
8. **S/0765/06/RM** - Erection of a hotel with associated car parking withdrawn.
9. **S/1417/06/RM** - Approval of 31 flats on parcel E1.
10. **S/2156/06/RM** - Erection of 137 bed hotel refused. Appeal in the form of a public inquiry outstanding but no date agreed.

Planning Policy

11. Until recently, the adopted Local Plan 2004 formed part of the development Plan for South Cambridgeshire, setting out the planning policy framework for development within the district. It was these policies for which the previous application for a hotel on the Arbury Camp site was considered. With the introduction of the new planning system in 2004 the Council has to produce a suite of Development Plan Documents (DPD), known collectively as a Local Development Framework (LDF), which will replace the Local Plan.
12. **The Core Strategy DPD** was adopted in January 2007 with the Development Control Policies DPD were adopted in July 2007 and as such a number of the Local Plan 2004 policies have now been superseded. However the Site Specific Policies DPD is currently in a draft form dated January 2006 with the hearings for this Examination expected to start on 27 November 2007. As such and until this DPD is formally adopted there are still some of the Local Plan 2004 policies which remain in force.
13. Core Strategy DPD (January 2007) policies relevant to this application: **ST/1 Green Belt; ST/2 Housing Provision; and ST/8 Employment Provision.**
14. Development Control Policies DPD (July 2007) policies relevant to this application: **DP/1 Sustainable development; DP/2 Design of New Development; DP/3 Development Criteria; DP/4 Infrastructure and New Development; DP/5 Cumulative development; DP/6 Construction Methods; SF/6 Public Art and New Development; SF/7 Underground Pipes, Wires, Fibres and Cables; SF/9 Protection of Existing Recreation Areas; NE/1 Energy Efficiency; NE/2 Renewable Energy; NE/3 Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development; NE/6 Biodiversity; NE/7 Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance; NE/8 Groundwater; NE/9 Water and Drainage Infrastructure; NE/11 Flood Risk; NE/12 Water Conservation; NE/14 Lighting Proposals; NE/15 Noise Pollution; NE/16 Emissions; CH/2 Archaeological Sites; TR/1 Planning for more Sustainable Travel; TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards; TR/3 Mitigating Travel Impact; TR/4 Non-Motorised Modes; Appendix 1 Standards for car parking provision; Appendix 2 Standards for cycle provision.**
15. Site Specific Policies DPD (January 2006) policies relevant to this application: **SP/1 Cambridge Northern Fringe West.**
16. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 ("The County Structure Plan") **P1/3 Sustainable design in built development; P6/1 Development related provision; P8/6 Improving bus and community transport services; P9/8 Infrastructure provision.**
17. Government Policies **PPS1 Delivering sustainable development; PPS6 Planning for town centres; PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological conservation; PPS11 Regional spatial strategies; PPG13 Transport; PPS22 Renewable energy;**

PPG24 Planning and noise; PPS25 Development and flood risk; Good practice guide on planning for tourism; Regional Spatial Strategy 6.

Consultation

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (“The Local Plan”) CNF1 Cambridge Northern Fringe.

18. **Impington Parish Council** makes no recommendation but the members object to the lighting strategy not enough information and also the purple wash, object to the current proposal for public art as being inadequate. On the issue of design/landscaping of ramp to car park, and the opportunity to improve external aspect by use of landscape, the Parish raise no comment. Object to the noise assessment and that whilst there are different opinions regarding noise barrier from Gallagher's experts and Impington, advice is unresolved.
19. **SCDC Design Officer** confirms that the scheme follows the design principles established for the previous application, as supported by officers and includes a degree of articulation to break up the mass of the building. This is coupled with careful consideration of the fenestration to avoid a ‘barrack block’ appearance to the bedroom block. Revised design stemmed from need to provide additional parking, which is achieved through the introduction of a 1 ½ storey parking deck. Bedroom wing extended over the top of the raised parking deck, which has the advantage of providing more built form along northern edge of the site adjacent to A14 as suggested in the master plan and provides a better relationship to the commercial site to the east. Do not consider this to be a gateway site, however the treatment of elevation facing A14 and slip road is well considered and appropriate, while the 3D view of southern approach will suggest that building will relate positively to adjacent residential development. Minor changes could be sought regarding screen around parking deck with additional landscaping to act as a screen but this could be associated with a condition. Although signage on the tower will be subject to further application for advertisement consent it might be more sophisticated, with possible use of cutting out lettering using stainless steel to move away from ‘in-house’ design.
20. **SCDC Environmental Health Officer** raises no objection and confirms that the acoustic report indicates that with the removal of part of the A14 noise barrier, the mixed use/commercial building specification will achieve noise reduction criteria at the position and elevations where dwellings are proposed except at a “gap” in the linear ngement of the mixed-use/commercial buildings where two and three storey dwellings are proposed. The acoustic report suggests that an 8m high block wall be erected to achieve relevant sound reduction criteria in this area. I recommend this measure be incorporated to any consent granted in respect of the above-proposed development.
21. The acoustic report further comments that with or without the roadside barrier, in order to ensure conformance with the “reasonable internal noise criterion” in bedrooms at the north elevation, windows must remain closed. This will require that alternative means of ventilation must be considered to all bedrooms at the north elevation of the proposed hotel. Such ventilation may be mechanical but whatever method is employed it must ensure that the acoustic performance of the external building façade is not compromised unfavourably. In addition to mechanical ventilation, if window units are fitted with trickle vents they must not compromise the acoustic performance of the façade. I recommend that the aforementioned specification be incorporated into any consent granted in respect of this proposed development.

22. In relation to the external building façade materials and reflected noise from the proposed development, I have the following comments:
23. The acoustic report refers to absorptive finishes that are available for the façade of the building such as sound absorbing cellular structural masonry blocks. An example is given of Edenhall Noisemaster range. It is recommended that if the proposal is successful, the aforementioned materials be applied to the north facing elevations to the hotel and proposed mixed use/commercial development to help minimise reflected noise. It is further recommended that these measures be incorporated into any consent granted in respect of this proposed development.
24. **SCDC Landscape Officer** confirms that the revised landscaping plan is acceptable.
25. **SCDC Tree Officer** requests larger trees pits within car parking areas where the roots of the larger trees may cause problems in future. Ideally the rooting zone available to these trees should be a minimum of 5m and as such detail of the proposed tree pits and staking will be required.
26. **Highways Agency** raises no objections and advises on the following. Confirm that improvements to the A14 between Ellington and Fen Ditton recommended by the Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi Modal Study (CHUMMS) were added to the Targeted Programme of Improvement in April 2003. Proposals were put forward for public consultation in Spring 2005. As part of the proposals, the A14 between the Histon and Milton junctions would be widened to three lanes in each direction. The preferred Route was announced in March 2007, and a revised TR111 was issued to South Cambridgeshire District Council. However taking the above into account the Highways Agency advise that the proposed widening of the A14 is unlikely to physically affect potential future developments along the northern boundary of the Arbury Park development. Transfer of land to cater for widening forms part of the existing S278 agreement between the Agency and Gallagher Estates.
27. Turning to the proposed development, Faber Maunsell, who provide detailed advice to the Highways Agency, have looked at the submitted information and a copy of their report is provided as part of the consultation response from the Highway Agency. The Faber Maunsell report recommends that further information on the methodology used to support the statements made in the applicants travel assessment is provided by the applicant for further consideration. The previous recommendation made by the Highways Agency that the floor space of the restaurant be restricted to prevent the restaurant becoming a destination in its own right is again requested. It is also strongly recommended that the implementation of an area wide travel plan for Arbury Camp and not a multitude of individual travel plan for small parts of the site.
28. **County Archaeology** confirms that this site was the subject of a programme of archaeological investigation and that no further works are considered necessary in connection with this development proposal.
29. **County Highways Engineer** advises that the highway infrastructure plan as approved does not match that on the submitted plan in support of this application, particularly the area of the service access. The proposed layout must correspond with the infrastructure as being built/constructed.
30. **Environment Agency** confirms that the site is within Cell F6 (floodzone 1/<1ha) of the Environment Agency's PPS25 Flood Risk Standing Advice Matrix (March 2007). It is considered that there are no other Agency related issues in respect of this application and therefore, in line with current Government guidance, South Cambridgeshire District Council will be required to respond on behalf of the Agency in respect of flood risk and surface water drainage related issues. Reference is to be

made to recent correspondence, between the respective authorities and the Developers, in respect of complying with the original drainage strategy.

31. **Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service** confirms that additional water supplies for fire fighting are not required. Access and facilities for the Fire Service should be provided in accordance with the Building Regulations Approved Document B5, Section 16.
32. **Police Architectural Liaison Officer** has recommended a secure perimeter fence of a material more robust than chain link. Would suggest a 2 metres high weldmesh. Relying upon an adjoining developer along the southern boundary might compromise security on this site. Gates at entrances should also be fitted to a similar height and strength. The service access gates should be lockable and of a robust material and height to match the perimeter fence. A degree of uncontrolled access for vehicles might be seen necessary as far as the main entrance, together with a turning area, consideration should be given to the provision of access control barrier(s) associated with the up and down ramps, with exit secured by means such as the provision of a token obtained from the main reception. Lighting should also be provided to the car parking areas by means of column mounted white down lighters. Concern that the lighting provided by bollards may not be sufficient to facilitate facial and colour recognition. Not clear from drawings whether CCTV covers the central sections of the east car park, and this should be addressed.

Comments still awaited from:

33. **Drainage Engineer; Ecology Officer; Governor of Arbury primary school and Cambridge City Council.**

Representations

34. None received.

Planning Comments – Key Issues

Principle

35. Under the approved layout for the Arbury Park re-development this part of the site is allocated for commercial development. A commercial development would include office or light industrial use (Class B1) on the site and this allocation stretches along almost the entire length of the northern boundary of the Arbury Camp development. The purpose of locating commercial development within this area of the site is to allow for taller development to act as a noise attenuation screen between the A14 and the more noise sensitive residential development. In addition to the commercial area there are also five mixed-use areas allocated around the whole re-development site where a varied type of use would be encouraged.
36. As explained in the committee report for the previous hotel development, (S/2156/06/RM) the principle of a hotel development on the site is considered acceptable as the original outline consent included the provision of a hotel on the development. A hotel falls within use Class C1 which condition 27 of the original outline consent specified as a suitable development within one of the mixed-use areas. As already pointed out the application site is not located within one of the five mixed use areas but within a commercial area on the site. As such consideration in terms of the principle of the hotel development on this part of the site is a material consideration. Again this issue was considered as part of a previous application for a hotel (S/0765/06/RM) where the applicant obtained advice from Counsel. In this advice counsel considered both conditions 27 and 30 attached to the outline consent

relating to mixed uses and floor areas. Condition 27 amongst specifying suitable uses within particular areas, also limited the maximum area of land, gross floor space for buildings within the use classes as shown on a table attached to the consent. This table included a hotel (Class C1), which was not to exceed an area of 1.73Ha. Condition 30 required the submission of details of the proportion of mixed-use development upon the site within 6 months of the commencement of development. In taking these points into account it was Counsels opinion that whilst the development should be undertaken in accordance with the Development Framework Plan this was capable of amendment by way of an approval of reserved matters. It was also considered that the Local Authority had anticipated that there may be reserved matters which were inconsistent with the Framework Plan which could be permitted and therefore amend the Framework Plan. For this reason the principle of a hotel on the site was accepted as an appropriate development and as such an application would not be required to satisfy all of the tests in PPS6 as though it were an entirely new and untested proposal.

37. The site area for this current application is stated as 0.517Ha (1.277 acre) and as such would not conflict with condition 27 relating to development area for a hotel as specified in the Outline Consent. For these reasons the principle of a hotel development in this area of the site is considered acceptable.

Design/Appearance

38. As this was one of the reasons for the refusal of the last application, it is important to consider how this current application aims to address the failures of the earlier scheme. Due to the position of the site and the overall scale of the building the development will be clearly visible from along the A14 as well as from within the site by residents in the adjoining flats on parcel E1. As such the members of the planning committee considered that the design of the previous scheme was not of a high enough quality to represent this edge of Cambridge. To address this concern the revised application has been amended on the main elevations to improve the external appearance of the building form. The main changes include the extension to the length of the building over the decked parking area, the provision of slatted wooden panels on the north elevation fronting the A14, the provision of the decked parking area to the front and rear elevation of the building, changes to the massing of the building and fenestration details.
39. In considering these areas in detail, the increase in length of the building by an additional 22.5 metres will increase the emphasis of the building both within the site and from the A14. This emphasis will improve the general presence of the hotel building from outside the site to provide a defined edge to the Arbury Camp development as well as to the edge of Cambridge. The extension to the length of the building is not a straight linear shape but will incorporate 'kinks' to vary the angle of the elevation of the building to help improve in the appearance of the building. Furthermore as an additional benefit the increase in length will significantly improve the noise protection to the adjoining residential properties on parcel E1 as the extra length will screen the A14 from these properties as required under the Arbury Camp Design Guide.
40. Turning to the elevation treatments, these changes will add further variation and interest to the north and south facing elevations. The introduction of full height slatted wooden panels on the north facing elevation towards the A14 these have a dual use on the building, firstly to break up the appearance of the elevation and second to assist in sound absorbing to protect the existing residents of the neighbouring village. The southern elevation fronting the rear elevations of parcel E1 will maintain smaller slatted wood panels which will help break the elevation into an acceptable appearance. The revision to both the north and south facing elevations together with

set backs and forward projections are significant improvements to the elevation treatment compared to that of the previous scheme with a combination of both vertical and horizontal emphasis being created on the main elevations.

41. This revised hotel proposal was considered at the Arbury Camp Design Review Panel on 10 September where the scheme received some measure of support but not an overwhelmingly approval. Areas of concern included the use of the decked parking areas, which appeared awkward, clear views of the decked parking area will be possible from the apartment blocks on parcel E1 and the need to carefully consider the traffic implications on the access road, which will run past the front of the primary school. In considering these comments, the decked parking area is located within part of the site, which is not clearly visible from public areas, and the offset angle from the building will not be visible from the ground level. Although it is accepted this off-set angle will be visible from the apartments on land parcel E1 the majority of rooms at the rear of this apartment block are kitchens, bathrooms, stairwells and limited bedrooms. As such the impact of the offset angle is unlikely to be to the detriment of the character or appearance of the area or upon the amenities of the adjoining residential properties. The top area of the decked car park will be visible from the rear windows of the apartments on land parcel E1, however there will be little difference between this view and that of a surface car park which is likely to occupy this part of the site in any other development. Furthermore with the addition of landscaping along the edge of the decked structure the impact of the parking area is likely to be reduced.
42. The main access route serving this part of the commercial area and the application site also includes access to the school and residential parcels on the west side of the Arbury Camp development. The view of the applicant is that traffic visiting the hotel is unlikely to correspond with the school traffic and as such there is unlikely to be a conflict between the two. Furthermore as the site is allocated for commercial the alternative development would be for a B1 employment use and a comparison between an office use and a hotel use in terms of traffic visits needs to be carried out. This comparison has been done by the applicant as part of the submitted traffic assessment which shows that the level of trip generation is higher for a B1 employment use than that of a hotel and this has been accepted the Highways Agency. As such the hotel use is likely to generate a lower level of traffic compared to that of a commercial use on this part of the Arbury Camp development, with correspondingly less traffic passing the school site.
43. In terms of building height the applicant has adopted the same approach as with the original application and as suggested by officers in that the fourth floor has been stepped back from the main building line. This approach together with the use of a glazed curtain wall and an over sail roof area will create the appearance of a 'floating' roof. This will help reduce the bulky appearance and overall height of the building when viewed from both inside and outside the site. The use of glazing on the top floor, which will continue down either end of the building to the stairwells, will help 'lighten' the appearance of the building. In conclusion it is the officers opinion that the changes to the design of the building represent an improvement on the original scheme as considered by the Planning committee on 10 January 2007.
44. As with all new development the proposal needs to demonstrate that there will be a commitment to reducing carbon and use of fossil fuels. The applicant has submitted a BREEAM pre-assessment report of the proposed scheme, which demonstrates that the scheme would have a BREEAM Bespoke rating of 'Good'. To obtain this rating the applicants have stated that amongst other measures, the development would provide a Sedum roof over the third floor, which is equal to 45% of the total roof area, and which will reduce the level of storm water run-off during peak rain falls. The drainage of the site is linked to the overall drainage strategy of the main Arbury Park

re-development. However there is no specific attenuation measures related to the hotel development only that the drainage would link into the main drainage strategy for the Arbury site provided by the main developers. For this reason a condition should be attached to any planning permission granted for this development requiring details of drainage measures relating to the hotel development.

45. In terms of renewable energy the applicant has provided a report considering options for this site. The applicant has confirmed that more than 15% of the hotels energy will be obtained by the provision of a combined heat and power system (CHP), which is considered a low carbon producing energy source. In addition to this the applicant has also confirmed that the hotel will use a variable refrigerant flow system (VRF), which is a heat pump system capable of heating and cooling simultaneously whilst using waste energy from other areas within the building and distributing this energy to other parts of the building. The VRF to be installed within the building is listed as being very efficient in the BREEAM report and scores maximum points across the building. Other sustainable measures have been considered by the applicant including wind turbine, photo-voltaic cells and solar water heating but discounted for various reasons including cost, site location restrictions and maintenance issues.

Highway/parking issues

46. The revised proposal allows for a total of 135 car parking spaces arranged around the front, east side and rear of the hotel building and is a response to the second reason for refusal on the original application. This revised provision represents an increase in parking over the previous level by an additional 37 spaces however it is accepted that there is also an increase in accommodation levels by an extra 17 rooms. The increase in parking provision on the site does not equal the maximum amount as stated within the Parking Standards contained in Appendix 1 of the DPC, which would require the provision of 200 parking spaces for a hotel development of this size. It is however important to remember that the standards are for a maximum level of parking and not a minimum level to be achieved. In the previous application the applicant pointed out that based upon their experience over many decades of operating more than 450 hotels throughout the country there should be no fewer than 0.7 spaces per room for a hotel of this size and location. This experienced assessment is tested on a regular basis through analysis of parking trends across the hotels within the applicants' chain, which includes 40 bed units through to 200 bed hotels. The applicant continues by stating that each time rooms are added to an existing hotel, (the company's expansion in recent years has been 600 –750 new rooms per annum), parking surveys are undertaken to assess the use of the car park compared to the occupancy rate of the hotel. In the last five years over 300 such surveys have been carried out which allows the applicant to ensure that the level of parking provision on their sites is neither an over-provision nor falling short of requirement.
47. In revising this proposal the applicant has now increased the ratio of parking at the site to 0.87 spaces per room, which is clearly a significant increase compared to that of the previous application. Again in support of this parking arrangement the applicant has submitted the results of a survey carried out this year at four other hotels in the applicants' chain, which are of similar locations to that of the current application site. The hotels include Stevenage at 115 bed in size and positioned close to junction 7 of A1(M), Milton Keynes at 120 bed and located close to the A5, Luton at 129 bed and positioned close to the junction of the A6 and A505 and finally Bristol at 106 bed in size and located close to junction 17 of the M5. In terms of the parking at these other sites, the surveys were carried out where on at least 4 nights a week (generally Monday – Thursday) each hotel was fully occupied or almost so. Although it is accepted by the applicant that in each case there is a variable factor in the presence and size of a restaurant which in turn affects the size of the car park, in each case the

number of spaces allocated to the hotel use is less than the number of rooms. These proportions are, 81%, 83%, 70% and 76% respectively. From the survey results it is clear that none of the hotels experienced a short fall in parking provision even during nights where there was full occupancy in terms of rooms. Based upon the evidence provided it is clear that the applicant has a good understanding on the level of parking required for their sites and as such the provision of 135 spaces on the site will be adequate for the development. The applicant has also emphasised that under PPG13 (Transport) the level of parking provided on a development is now a maximum rather than a minimum and that local authorities should not require more spaces than a developer considers adequate to serve their development, other than in exceptional circumstances.

48. In this instance, the case for the proposed parking provision on the site has been justified. It is therefore unreasonable to insist on the application of a maximum standard for this edge of City site and as such, although the parking provision is below the maximum that could be sought for this type/size of development, it is not considered that a refusal on the grounds of parking could be substantiated.
49. Further support for the level of parking is provided with the submission of a green travel plan for members of staff. This plan would seek to appoint a Travel co-ordinator within the hotel who would be responsible for organising staff surveys to establish existing and preferred means of travel to work. This role would also include collection and co-ordination of incentives suggested by staff that might further reduce the dependence upon the private car as a source of travel. These incentives include the provision or review of inducements such as subsidised or loans for bus passes or cycle purchase. The applicant has also demonstrated through the revised ground floor layout with the provision of a covered cycle storage area for up to 36 cycles which in terms of the Councils adopted standards is 8.5 cycle spaces more than required for the level of staff. Furthermore the ground floor plan of the hotel includes a dedicated staff room, providing a shower, changing area and lockers to encourage staff to either cycle or walk to their place of work. The applicant has also pointed out that the site will be well served by new and existing public transport links such as the Cambridge Guided Bus route and that the new cycle route through the site will encourage cycle use.
50. The level of parking and the number of trips generated by the hotel use has been considered by the Highways Agency in the form of the applicants Transport Assessment. From this information although no objection to the principle of the hotel development has been submitted further information and points of clarification are sought, along with a request to limit the floor space of the hotel restaurant and for an area wide travel plan be implemented. The restriction on floor space of the restaurant is to ensure that the restaurant remains more for the use by the hotel guests rather than becoming a destination in its own right and could be controlled by condition.
51. With regards to the area wide travel plan there are potential logistical problems with this approach in that it would require the applicant to rely upon the commercial area being built at the same time as the hotel and then a co-ordinated approach to the provision of a travel plan. All of which are outside of the control of the applicant and there is no guarantee that sites would be constructed at the same time. Furthermore other than the application submitted by Barratt Homes for a change from commercial to residential use, there are currently no other applications for commercial development along the northern edge of the Arbury Camp site with the Council. In the event that the hotel is granted reserved matters consent and work start on site, until all other development on the Arbury Camp site is completed an area wide travel plan could not be implemented. This would therefore leave the hotel operator with one of two options either to have no green travel plan/travel co-ordinator or to provide one of their own. The applicant by submitting a green travel plan has shown a willingness to

address the potential problem of staff travelling to work by car and using valuable parking space within the site. Since the receipt of this request by the Highways Agency the sustainability officer at the Council is however looking into the issue of a co-ordinated travel plan across the site, which the applicant could be involved with. Any further progress on this will be reported verbally during this meeting.

52. It is also worth noting that under schedule 7 of the S106 agreement attached to the Outline planning consent, where at least 8 persons shall be employed on any part of the Site used as a separate planning unit for any purpose other than residential use (herein referred to as the "Unit") the Owner (here meaning the owner of the freehold interest or any leasehold interest derived there from for a term yet unexpired exceeding 21 years in that Unit) is required to adopt a Travel for Work Plan in the form set out in Annex 1 of the agreement. As such the applicant is required to adopt a suitable travel to work plan and therefore a further condition, which would 'double-up' on this requirement, would be considered unnecessary and hence fail the test of a condition as set out in Circular 11/95, 'The use of conditions in planning permissions'.

Conclusion

53. This is a revised application following the refusal of a hotel on this part of the Arbury Camp redevelopment site. The applicant has revised the scheme in order to address the two reasons for refusal.
54. On the issue of design the applicant has made significant alterations to the design of the building to incorporate changes to elevations to improve the appearance and presence of the hotel from both within and outside the site. Some the changes to the north facing elevations fronting onto the A14 will also help reduce any potential reflection of noise from the A14 traffic to assist with the problem of noise which the Parish Council state exists with the current noise barrier along the A14 boundary.
55. The applicant although accepting that the accommodation is viewed as a 'budget hotel' confirms that this is not to suggest the design and/or materials used on the build are budget in terms of cost or appearance. The design has picked up on the advice provided by both the Arbury Design Panel, from meetings with officers of the Council, in response to the concerns raised by members of the committee as well as architectural features on other developments within the Arbury Camp site. The choice of materials is in line with those required under the Arbury Camp Design Guide to which all developers on the site are working.
56. Turning to the second reason for refusal the extension to the length of the building has allowed for the provision of additional parking spaces in the form of a decked parking area over which the hotel will be constructed. The increase in parking although accompanied by an increase in accommodation space is at a significantly higher ratio than that of the previously refused scheme. Furthermore the applicant has provided details of parking surveys carried out this year at 4 other hotels within the applicant's chain at locations similar to that of the application site. From this information it is clear that the level of parking required at the hotels surveyed did not require the same number of spaces as to room numbers even on nights when there was full occupancy at the hotel. The survey work is further backed by a green travel plan, cycle storage and changing room facilities to encourage staff to either walk or cycle to the hotel rather than use their car.
57. Although further information has been requested by the Highways Agency no objection to the principle of the hotel development has been provided subject to a condition restricting the size of the restaurant and an area wide travel plan. The floor space of the restaurant could be controlled through a condition while the requirement

of an area wide travel plan is being considered in terms of a co-ordinated approach for the remaining parts of the Arbury Camp redevelopment.

58. Due to the above reasons the application is considered to represent an acceptable form of development within the site and has addressed the concerns expressed by the members of the committee as outlined in the reasons for refusal on the previous application.

Recommendation

59. At the time of writing this report some transport issues remained unresolved. Discussions with the applicants and their agents are continuing and an oral report will be made at the meeting on the latest position. If by the time of the Committee meeting the majority of the outstanding issues have been satisfactorily resolved or appear capable of being resolved quickly, the Committee may wish to indicate whether it is minded to grant permission, subject to suitable conditions. If the Committee is minded to grant permission, they may wish to consider delegating the final decision to issue permission to the Executive Director / Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chair.
60. Subject to no adverse comments from the Highways Agency following receipt of the additional information that reserved matters approval be granted subject to the following conditions:
1. Standard Conditions 52 – Implementation of landscaping (Reason 52);
 2. Sc60 – Details of boundary treatment (Rc60);
 3. Surface water drainage details;
 4. Foul water drainage details;
 5. Restriction of hours of use of power operated machinery;
 6. Restriction on floor space of restaurant;
 7. Details of Art;
 8. Details of hard surfaces;
 9. Ecological details;
 10. Cycle storage;
 11. Developers compound;
 12. Finished floor levels;
 13. Lighting details;
 14. Access details to be agreed and provided;
 15. Provision of car parking;
 16. Fire hydrants;
 17. Details of refuse/storage area;
 18. Details of landscaping treatment to car park;
 19. Details of tree pits;
 20. Submission of material samples;
 21. Details of room ventilation methods;
 22. Details of CCTV coverage.

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:**
 - P1/3** (Sustainable design in built development)
 - P6/1** (Development related provision)
 - P8/6** (Improving bus and community transport services)
 - P9/8** (Infrastructure provision)
 - **Development Control Polices DPD July 2007:**
 - DP/1** (Sustainable development);
 - DP/2** (Design of New Development);
 - DP/3** (Development Criteria);
 - SF/6** (Public Art and New Development);
 - NE/1** (Energy Efficiency);
 - NE/2** (Renewable Energy);
 - TR/1** (Planning for more Sustainable Travel);
 - TR/2** (Car and Cycle Parking Standards);
 - TR/3** (Mitigating Travel Impact);
 - Appendix 1** (Standards for car parking provision);
 - Appendix 2** (Standards for cycle provision).
 - **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004: CNF1 (Cambridge Northern Fringe).**
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations, which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Residential amenity including noise disturbance and overlooking issues
 - Highway safety
 - Visual impact on the locality
3. All other material planning considerations have been taken into account. None is of such significance as to outweigh the reason for the decision to approve the planning application.
4. All of the conditions, contained in the outline planning permission, continue to apply so far as the same are capable of taking effect but subject to the additional conditions set out above.
5. The applicant attention is drawn to condition 10 of the outline planning consent S/2379/01/0 which requires compliance with the agreed noise attenuation scheme. This requires a simple noise mitigation schedule that will identify the noise levels, NEC classification and mitigation measures (as specified in SCLP Appendix 11/2). The noise mitigation schedule will take account of the attenuation provided by the proposed built-form of the buildings themselves and of the layout of the rooms within the buildings.
6. The building shall be accessible to disabled persons and provide facilities for them.

7. Surface water from impermeable vehicle parking areas and service areas shall not be discharged other than through a storm by-pass oil interceptor the details of which shall have been previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
8. Any oil or liquid chemical storage tanks and associated pipework shall be sited within an impervious bunded area details of which shall have been previously submitted to and approved in writing the Local Planning Authority.
9. Save with the written consent of the Local Planning Authority, all pipes, meter boxes, fibres, wires and cables required by statutory undertakers and other appropriate bodies including cable TV operators shall be placed underground or in suitably concealed locations, provided this would not damage areas of ecological or archaeological importance.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire LDF
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- S/2379/01/O; S/2298/03/F; S/0765/06/RM; S/1417/06/RM; S/2156/06/RM.

Contact Officer: Wayne Campbell – Principle Planning Officer City Edge
Telephone: (01954) 713312