

West Area Planning Committee

5th January 2016

Application Number: 15/03105/FUL

Decision Due by: 26th January 2016

Proposal: Erection of 2 storey extension together with rear extensions at levels D, E and F, new entrance, lay-bys and nitrogen tank.

Site Address: Tinbergen Building South Parks Road Oxford Oxfordshire

Ward: Holywell Ward

Agent: Mr Robert Linnell

Applicant: The Chancellor, Masters
And Scholars Of The
University

Recommendation:

The West Area Planning Committee is recommended to approve planning permission subject to conditions, for the following reasons:

Reasons for Approval

- 1 The proposed two storey extension, erection and replacement of the pods, improvements and alterations to the entrance, provision of two lay-bys, nitrogen tank and internal alterations are considered acceptable in terms of their design, appearance, and impact on street scene. The proposed development would not have an adverse impact on highway safety and adequate provision is provided for cyclists and pedestrians within the site. The development would not harm the setting of the nearby Central (University and City) Conservation Area. The proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on biodiversity, specifically the habitats of protected species. The proposals include provision of on-site energy generation by renewables. In reaching a decision to approve the development, all responses to the proposed development have been carefully considered. For these reasons the development is considered to be acceptable in the context of Policy SP58 of the Sites and Housing Plan (2013), Policies CS9, CS10, CS12, CS18 and CS29 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policies CP1, CP6, CP8, CP9, CP11, CP22, TR4, TR12, HE9 and HE7 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016.
- 2 The Council considers that the proposal accords with the policies of the development plan as summarised below. It has taken into consideration all other material matters, including matters raised in response to consultation and

publicity. Any material harm that the development would otherwise give rise to can be offset by the conditions imposed.

- 3 Officers have considered carefully all objections to these proposals. Officers have come to the view, for the detailed reasons set out in the officers report, that the objections do not amount, individually or cumulatively, to a reason for refusal and that all the issues that have been raised have been adequately addressed and the relevant bodies consulted.

Conditions

- 1 Development begun within time limit
- 2 Develop in accordance with approved plans
- 3 Materials as specified
- 4 Landscape plan required
- 5 Landscape hard surface design - tree roots
- 6 Landscape underground services - tree roots
- 7 Tree Protection Plan (TPP) 2
- 8 Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) 1
- 9 Biodiversity Enhancements
- 10 Cycle parking
- 11 No external lighting
- 12 Plant Design
- 13 Flue and External Staircases
- 14 PD Rights - Part 2, Class C
- 15 Enclosure of Nitrogen Tank
- 16 Noise
- 17 Energy Measures
- 18 Archaeology
- 19 Repeat Ecology survey (within 12 months)
- 20 No vegetation clearance (March-August)

Principal Planning Policies:

Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016

CP1 - Development Proposals

CP6 - Efficient Use of Land & Density

CP8 - Design Development to Relate to its Context

CP10 - Siting Development to Meet Functional Needs

CP11 - Landscape Design

CP13 - Accessibility

CP18 - Natural Resource Impact Analysis

CP19 - Nuisance

CP20 - Lighting

CP21 - Noise

TR12 - Private Non-Residential Parking

TR3 - Car Parking Standards

TR4 - Pedestrian & Cycle Facilities

HE7 - Conservation Areas

HE9 - High Building Areas
HE10 - View Cones of Oxford
HE2 - Archaeology
CP9 - Creating Successful New Places
NE15 - Loss of Trees and Hedgerows

Core Strategy

CS2 - Previously developed and greenfield land
CS9 - Energy and natural resources
CS10 - Waste and recycling
CS11 - Flooding
CS12 - Biodiversity
CS17 - Infrastructure and developer contributions
CS18 - Urban design, town character, historic environment
CS29 - The universities

Sites and Housing Plan

SP58 – Oxford University Science Area & Keble Road Triangle

Other Planning Documents

Oxford University Masterplan
Assessment of the Oxford View Cones

Relevant Site History

- 15/01986/DEM - Application to determine whether prior approval is required for the method of demolition – Prior approval not required

Representations Received

44 Beauchamp Place, Objections:

- Effect on character of the area
- Heritage value of building
- Impact on conservation area
- Cultural importance of building
- Concerns about function of building
- Loss of views (particularly from the building's outdoor areas)
- Inadequate cycle parking provision

Statutory Consultees

- Highways Authority

No objections, subject to the satisfactory submission of a S278 agreement relating to the provision of the proposed laybys and the Local Planning Authority being satisfied with the cycle parking provision.

- Thames Water Utilities Limited

No objections

Site Description

Location

1. The Tinbergen Building is a large five storey building situated on the corner of South Parks Road and St Cross Road; within the University of Oxford's science area to the north-east of the City Centre.
2. To the south-west of the application site lies the Pharmacology Building, with the Peter Medawar Building for Pathogen Research lying to the immediate west of the site. North of the application site, beyond South Parks Road lies the entrance to University Parks and the path leading to the Marston Cycle Route. To the east of the application site is Linacre College and college sports grounds. The University Club is south of the application site with a large area sports grounds associated with the club immediately to the south of the application site boundary.

Use of Building

3. The Tinbergen Building is principally used for teaching and research by the Departments of Zoology, Experimental Psychology and Biochemistry. The current use of the building is therefore regarded to be a non-residential institution (Use Class D1). The application site encompasses the entire of the Tinbergen Building which fills almost the entire site.

History of Building

4. The Tinbergen Building has a distinctive appearance, the building was completed in 1970 and is an example of Brutalist architecture. The Tinbergen Building was designed by Sir Leslie Martin, a renowned architect who also designed the nearby St Cross Building.
5. The Tinbergen Building is named after Nikolaas Tinbergen a joint recipient of the 1973 Nobel Prize for Physiology or Medicine; his Nobel prize winning research concerned the organisation and elicitation of individual and social behaviour patterns in animals.

Existing Form, Layout and Design

6. The form and layout of the building is complex and distinctive but highly relevant to the consideration of the application (which relates to several elements of the existing structure and site). There are two full height elements that are centred around a central servicing area, these run parallel with South Parks Road (and perpendicular to St Cross Road). Extending to the north-west and south east of these central blocks are three symmetrical wings, these run parallel with St Cross Road. The symmetrical wings have a distinctive stepped form such that they are lowest on the north-west elevation (South Parks Road) and south-east elevation (adjacent to the University Club Sports Ground); they also have a uniform square appearance such that they appear as a series of stepped blocks. The resultant form of the existing building means that despite a large bulk of development it is broken up into a complex series of blocks that reduces its monolithic mass.

7. The main entrance to the building is on South Parks Road and is set back from the road and rest of the building; as a result the main entrance is not particularly prominent in the street scene. A walkway at first floor level connects two of the blocks above the walkway, this was installed as a later addition for fire safety reasons. There is an existing ginko tree close to the main entrance door; though as a result of being within the set back entrance area it is not visible in the wider street scene.
8. In the centre of the building is a recessed courtyard area with steps running down to the University Club Sports Ground on the south west elevation. This area of the site was used until very recently as storage and contained a number of small buildings that have recently been demolished.
9. There are existing paths around the side of the building that provide access to entrances within the central part of the building and provide access to courtyards with some cycle parking. The majority of cycle parking is at the front of the building and is located underneath the canopy on the frontage of South Parks Road.
10. Since the completion of the building in 1971 there have been two periods of successive roof extensions involving the development of 'pods'. These have been roof extensions to the block like roof elements of the Tinbergen Building to provide additional space within the building. The first pods constructed on the building were built between 1991 and 1994 and have a mansard type appearance and are clad in zinc; they are also characterised by providing very few windows. There are three of these 'older style' pods on the north-west elevation (South Parks Road) and one in the south-west corner of the site. There are also newer type pods on the south, west and east elevation. These were installed in 2004 and have a more rectangular appearance that harmonises with the built form of the original building; they are finished in aluminium.
11. The roof of the existing building is flat with parapet walls. There are three large vertical elements that project beyond the roof, these house lifts.

Materials

12. The entire building is constructed from poured and pre-cast concrete; with only the pods having a different external finish (zinc and aluminium as outlined above). The facades of the building have a distinctive pattern of ribbon windows which have been continued in the case of the newer type pods.

Car Parking

13. There is an existing basement level with a ramp access onto St Cross Road. This area provides limited car parking for the building. This also serves as the main servicing area for the building. There are currently 38 car parking spaces on site.

Proposed Development

14. It is proposed to erect a two storey extension to the south-west of the existing building (towards the University Club Sports Ground), add seven new pod roof extensions, replace four existing pod roof extensions, renovate and remodel the existing main entrance, install a nitrogen tank, plant and equipment (associated with the new development and existing operations) and carry out substantial internal and external refurbishments. The main individual aspects of the proposals are set out in more detail below.

Two Storey Extension

15. The largest new aspect of the development proposed is a two storey extension that would be located adjacent to the south-west boundary of the site; adjacent and connected to the existing Tinbergen Building. The proposed extension would be 62m in width and 12m in depth; extending across the entire rear wall of the Tinbergen Building. The proposed extension would link into the Tinbergen Building with a link section of approximately 3.2m depth (to afford greater light into the existing building and lobby areas). The proposed extension would have an overall height of approximately 10m, with a flat roof.
16. The built form of the proposed extension has been carefully considered. The main south-west façade of the extension would emulate the 'bar' type feature (the full two storey height rectangular section) behind it. It is also proposed to be broken into five distinct blocks, with one of the blocks being entirely open, framing the staircase leading to the courtyard at the centre of the Tinbergen Building. The upper quarter of the façade would be open to enable light to enter into the building through a lightwell. Further lightwells are proposed above the lobby area.
17. The proposed materials and finish for the extension would be mainly pre-cast concrete to match the rest of the existing building. A terracotta screen is proposed on the main façade of the building. The proposed windows have aluminium frames and trims.
18. The proposed extension would contain chemistry labs and teaching over two floors, with areas of office accommodation over three floors. The upper portion of the building would contain the plant room for the building which would be entirely enclosed. Solar panels are proposed on top of the roof. As a result of the use of the building as labs there are some parts of the extension that would not have windows; the wall being proposed to contain fume cupboards.
19. The proposed extension would be built to high energy performance standard with design features to maximise natural light and ventilation.
20. Details of extraction equipment for the chemistry labs have been provided, these proposed to make use of existing vertical elements of the building; the existing lift area in the central block would contain ducts associated with the extraction from fume cupboards from the chemistry building.

New and Replacement Pods

21. It is proposed to replace all four of the existing mansard style pods (the older pods that were originally built in the 1990s). Three of these pods are located on the north-west elevation and one is located in the south-west corner of the building. It is also proposed to install seven new pods to match the existing four rectangular pods on the building (that were built in 2004). Three of the seven new pods would be located on east elevation, facing onto St Cross Street, two on the west elevation with one located in the centre of the south elevation and one located on the north elevation. The distribution of the new pods reflects the desire to infill the breaks in the steps that resulted from previous extensions and thereby re-instate the original architect's vision for the building as three symmetrical stepped fingers emanating from a central rectangular core.
22. The new pods would be constructed using a lightweight aluminium frame and a unitised metal cladding that match the existing rectangular type pods on the building.
23. The proposed pods would provide additional office and accommodation within the building.
24. Although the new and refurbished pods would be on top of existing roof areas they would not project beyond the existing highest storey of the roof.

Nitrogen Tank

25. It is proposed to install a nitrogen tank (to contain the element in its gaseous and liquid form). The tank would be located within a fenced enclosure between the Tinbergen Building and the Peter Medawar building at the west of the application site. The proposed tank would not be visible in the public realm.

Alterations to Entrance Area and Internal Changes

26. The proposed alterations to the entrance would involve a small front extension to enclose an existing undercroft. The existing metal footbridge is also proposed to be refurbished and will provide a new location for signage at the front of the building. A DDA compliant ramp will also be provided into the building. New doors and a refurbished reception centre will also be provided.
27. Internal improvements are also proposed to the building. These changes do not require planning permission but are noted in the application and represent part of the extensive refurbishments to the building. A continuation of the new reception area will open into a social hub and corridor linking the front of the building on South Parks Road with the access onto the University Club Sports Ground. New meeting spaces and improved circulation within the building will be provided.
28. The building has also recently been cleaned (which did not require planning permission) which has enhanced the visual appearance of the

building.

Officers Assessment:

29. Officers consider the principal determining issues to be:

- Principle of development
- Design, site layout and built forms;
- Impact on high building area and view cones;
- Living conditions of neighbouring properties
- Heritage, including impact on the setting of the Conservation Area;
- Access and parking
- Landscaping and trees
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Noise
- Biodiversity; and
- Sustainability.

Principle of development

30. The application site lies within the area defined as the University Science Area and Keble Road Triangle as set out in Policy SP58 of the Sites and Housing Plan (2013). This policy supports the development of academic institutional uses and associated research subject to design, conservation and car parking considerations.

31. Policy CS29 of the Oxford Core Strategy (2011) requires that any new academic floorspace relating to the University of Oxford should take place within their own existing sites. In the case of this application, this requirement is met.

32. Following on from the above, Officers have considered the principal of development on the application site in a wider context of national and local planning policy. In this case, the proposed two storey extension would take place on previously developed land; the National Planning Policy Framework together with Policy CS2 of the Oxford Core Strategy (2011) requires that the majority of new development take place on previously developed land.

33. Policy CP6 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 requires that new development makes more efficient use of land. The proposed development involves the creation of additional floors within an existing building; the development is also associated with the modernisation of the site and integration with new development (the proposed extension). The resultant development would maximise the use of the existing site and Officers regard that Policy CP6 would support in principle the proposed development on this basis.

Design

Site Layout and Built Form

34. The proposed development has been carefully considered in relation to its built form. The proposed two storey extension would be sited in such a way that would complement the existing built form of the Tinbergen Building by continuing both the stepped appearance the rectangular form of the pod elements of the building.
35. The proposed refurbishment of the pods and new pods would also contribute positively to the built form of the Tinbergen Building. The application includes significant information considering the original layout and shape of the Tinbergen Building as originally envisaged by Sir Leslie Martin and the proposed layout of pods would restore the shape and profile that was originally intended.
36. The proposed entrance area enhancements would not be particularly visible in the public realm and do not represent a significant change in terms of built form. The entrance would still be set back from the façade (facing onto South Parks Road). However, Officers consider that the proposals would contribute positively to the appearance of the building by modernising the appearance of the entrance area and creating a stronger visual marker to identify the entrance.
37. Officers consider that the scheme offers a significant opportunity in terms of improving the appearance of the building in design terms and taking a more strategic approach to extending it whilst also correcting the previous piecemeal additions to the building.

Materials

38. The proposed materials for the development have been selected on the basis of ensuring that the proposals harmonise effectively with the existing building. Officers consider that the choice of materials is suitable and will ensure that the developments are not discordant additions and represent high quality design.
39. Very detailed proposals have been submitted in relation to the proposed two storey extension; particularly the treatment of the façade of that building.
40. As the details of materials to be used have been submitted during application stage, officers have recommended that a condition be included that ensure only those materials are used.

Impact on Street scene

41. The proposed development would be visible in the public realm; specifically it would be visible within the street scene of South Parks Road and St Cross Street. A glancing view of the proposed development, chiefly the proposed two storey extension would be visible from Mansfield Road adjacent to the University Club.

42. The application site occupies a prominent corner plot and as well as its impact on street scene it would be visible in the wider public realm, including University Parks (opposite the site) and entrance to the Marston Cycle Route (where a unique view of both the front and side elevation of the building is provided). Officers have considered the visibility of the existing building within the street scene and the public realm as part of an assessment of the design of the proposals.
43. The proposed development has been carefully considered in terms of how it would address the street scene. The built form and appearance of the pods would ensure that it would harmonise effectively with both the existing building and the original vision of the architect.
44. The proposed extension to the building would create the largest areas of new floorspace but have been sited in such a way that this aspect of the scheme would not be as visually prominent when viewed in the public realm. The existing wall and vegetation along St Cross Road would soften the appearance of the proposed extension and reduce its overall impact on the public realm. The proposed size and scale of the extension would be visually acceptable in this location and has been carefully considered to ensure that it forms an appropriate visual relationship with the existing building.
45. The proposed additions to the roofscape in terms of the flues, solar panels, ducts and stairs associated with the developments on the site have been deliberately proposed in such a way that they closely relate to the existing built form of the Tinbergen Building which would minimise their visual intrusion in the public realm. Further to this, Officers have been mindful of the character of this part of the City where a number of science buildings contain similar plant and equipment that is associated with the research and work of their occupiers. In this way, the proposals for plant and equipment represent normal functional additions to the building.
46. In addition to the public realm, Officers have considered the impact of the proposed development on other views. One of the most interesting views provided of the existing Tinbergen Building is available from the University Club building that lies on Mansfield Road. The University Club benefits from extensive terraces and a large sports ground that is contiguous with the application site. The proposed two storey extension and a number of the pod additions will be prominent when viewed from that building and the associated sports ground. Officers consider that the proposed design has been thoughtfully designed in terms of its relationship with its surroundings and this is typified by the approach taken with regards to the respectful built form, careful detailing and sensitive use of materials.

Design review panel, pre-application advice and consultation

47. The application was considered by the Oxford Design Review Panel; as a result of the panel's comments there were aspects of the design that were altered. The proposed development has also been the subject of

extensive consultation and pre-application discussions.

48. For the above reasons, officers recommend that the proposed development is acceptable in terms of its design.

Living Conditions

49. The application site lies approximately 110m from the nearest residential property (in St Cross Road). Officers have considered the impact of the proposed development on nearby residential occupiers in terms of loss of privacy, impact on light and whether or not the building would have an obtrusive impact. Officers consider that the distance between the building and nearby residents means that there would not be any of these detrimental impacts on amenity and the development would therefore be acceptable in terms of its impact on occupiers.

Heritage, including impact on the setting of the Conservation Area Conservation Area

50. The application site lie outside of the Central (University and City) Conservation Area; but the boundary of the Conservation Area runs along the southern and eastern edges of the site. Officers have had regard to the impact of the proposed development on the setting of the Conservation Area, including views from within the Conservation Area of the building. The design of the proposed extension, pods and other additions (notably external staircases, flues and ducts) would not have a detrimental impact on the setting of the Conservation Area; the development would relate closely to the existing built form of the building and the proposed use of materials would ensure that it harmonised with existing development on-site. The proposed nitrogen tank would not be visible in the Conservation Area.

Historical Importance of Building

51. The application contains information relating to the heritage significance of the Tinbergen Building itself. Other buildings designed by Sir Leslie Martin have been considered to be important examples of 20th Century architecture, particularly associated with the Brutalist style. Within Oxford, the St Cross Building which was also designed by Martin is a listed building; other famous examples of his work include the Royal Festival Hall in London. The Tinbergen Building is not listed but the application does include information about the heritage significance of the building. Officers note that there has been significant care and attention with regards to the design of the proposals to ensure that the original architectural vision for the building, including its unique built form, has been preserved.

Archaeology

52. The application site lies within an area of archaeological interest and importance. An initial study has been carried out and this has indicated the potential presence of other items of interest. As a result, Officers have

recommended a condition be included that would require further archaeological investigations as well as recording and presentation of findings.

Building Height, Impact on High Building Area and View Cones

High Building Area (Policy HE9)

53. The application site lies within the defined 'high building area' as set out in Policy HE9 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016. This requires that new buildings not be built any higher than 18.2m from ground level or 79.3m above sea level; whichever is the lower. In the case of existing buildings that are being proposed for redevelopment, where they already exceed this height the Council must carefully consider their appearance within the townscape and skyline.
54. Parts of the existing Tinbergen Building exceed 18.2m in height, with the top floor of the building being approximately 20m in height (when measured from the ground level) or approximately 21.5m from street level. The existing lift blocks protrude beyond this level to an overall height of approximately 25m from ground level. On this basis, the existing Tinbergen Building already exceeds the prescribed height of buildings that would normally be permitted within the high building area. Some redevelopment of this site above the prescribed maximum height is therefore acceptable in principle but does need to be carefully considered.

View Cones (Policy HE10)

55. Policy HE10 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 deals with view cones; these are the defined areas where views from particular locations are considered to be notably significant. The policy requires that development within these areas needs to protect the defined views. The Tinbergen Building lies within the high building area and not within any of the defined view cones. The development lies within the path of the view from Elsfield, so consideration from this defined view is assessed in particular detail below.

Assessment

56. Officers have considered the provisions of Policy HE9 and consider that the most appropriate way of assessing the proposals against the policy is to consider the three distinct areas of development that could have an impact upon the townscape and skyline. These elements are the proposed two storey extension, the proposed (and refurbishment) of pods and the proposed vertical elements and plant (ducts, staircases and flues etc). An assessment of these elements is detailed below.
57. The recently produced 'Assessment of the Oxford View Cones' has been a particularly useful document in terms of assessing the proposals. Officers have also carried out a site visit with the impact on the Elsfield view cone in mind and have sought further information from the applicant's agent relating to the impact of the development on the skyline.

Two Storey Extension

58. The largest single mass of new development proposed would be the two storey extension. Parts of this extension would be built on land that was relatively undeveloped, having previously contained outbuildings and storage areas. In many respects, the proposed extension could be arguably assessed on the basis of being a new building in the context of Policy HE9 but could also be considered to be a redevelopment of an existing site. Regardless of how the proposed extension is assessed, it's overall height falls below the 18.2m (or 79.3m above sea level) limit for buildings as set out in Policy HE9 and is therefore in conformity with that policy. In reaching this recommendation, Officers have been mindful of the proposed solar panels on the roof of the building which fall within the prescribed maximum height. The decision by the applicant to contain all plant within the proposed extension's upper floor means that there would be a reduced visual impact in terms of townscape and skyline, particularly from nearby buildings.

Pod Extensions

59. Parts of the pods at the highest level (Level F) protrude beyond the high buildings level defined in Policy HE9. The proposed pods would relate very closely to the existing building and would not protrude prominently about the surrounding bulk of the Tinbergen Building. Officers consider that when viewed from a distance this would mean that the additional pods would not create a discordant feature that would obscure or detract from views of surrounding buildings. The carefully considered design of the building means that the proposed pods would essentially reflect the overall shape and pattern of development that exists already in terms of the building's form.

Plant and Vertical Elements

60. Parts of the proposed vertical elements (the ducts and flues associated with the extraction from the new extension) and the plant would be located above the high buildings level defined in Policy HE9. Officers have carefully considered the acceptability of these additions which relate very closely to the existing vertical elements (the lift blocks). Proposed staircases would be screened within the bulk of the existing building. The proposed plant would be located within the centre of the building which would reduce its overall impact and prominence. Officers recommend that the relatively small bulk of these additions in the context of the existing bulk of the building and their siting relative to the building's form would mean that they would form an acceptable visual relationship in the context of the skyline and not create a visually discordant feature.
61. The applicant's agent has provided further information about the requirement for the extraction equipment and plant to be provided. This is needed to ensure that the fume extraction from the chemistry extension is functional and is therefore essential to the working of the development as a whole. This matter was carefully considered at the design stage and Officers consider that these elements are suitable in design terms. However, the external treatment of these elements has not been

extensively detailed within the existing application and a condition has been recommended that would require these details prior to the commencement of this aspect of the development.

Other Additions

62. For clarity, the proposed nitrogen tank is at ground level and will not be visible in the skyline.

Concluding Points in Relation to Building Height

63. Officers have considered the overall visibility of the building when viewed from further distances. The building is visible across the meadow from the Marston cycle route and recreation ground; though it would not block views of the skyline from this direction. Officers have also considered the impact of the extensions on the view from Elsfield. The Elsfield view is specifically considered in the view cones of Oxford (referred to in Policy HE9 and HE10 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016). The Tinbergen Building is not particularly visible from this direction because it is sited amongst other science buildings and trees (which obscure it even in winter). More importantly the proposals would not block the view of the spires or detract from them when viewed from Elsfield nor would it compromise the wider view of the roofscape of the Victorian extensions to Oxford. Officers recommend that the development is therefore acceptable in the context of Policy HE9 having taken into account all of the relevant considerations.

Access, Parking and Cycle Parking

Access and Car Parking

64. The proposals relating to access and parking have been considered in relation to Policy SP58 of the Sites and Housing Plan (2013). The proposed development would result in the loss of 4 of the 38 existing car parking spaces but there are separate requirements to provide laybys on both South Parks Road and St Cross Road. The development minimises the amount of car parking and slightly reduces the overall capacity of the site for car parking; Officers therefore suggest that the development conforms with the requirements of Policy SP58. The Highway Authority have raised no objections but have requested that a Section 278 agreement is provided to deal with the laybys. Officers recommend that the development is acceptable regardless of the provision of the laybys which lie outside of the application site; on this basis it is not necessary to provide the Section 278 agreement as part of this proposal but this can be sought separately by the applicant with the Highway Authority.

Cycle Parking

65. The existing Tinbergen site currently contains a large amount of cycle parking, 377 spaces. But many of the spaces are provided by a variety of different cycle parking designs, including wall mounted hoops. It is proposed to provide significant investment in cycle parking as part of the proposed development. Firstly, existing cycle parking facilities would be standardised to be provide a uniform design of Sheffield Stands with a

minimum distance of between stands of approximately 1m with more popular cycle parking areas having a greater distance between stands of approximately 0.9m. A bicycle parking system with a vertical stacked arrangement is also proposed to provide approximately an additional 150 spaces within a secure caged area to the side of the Tinbergen area; this is proposed to provide a large concentration of cycle parking in a high demand area that would also be secure. The total cycle spaces to be provided would be 502 spaces

Landscaping and trees

66. The proposals require some work to existing trees as well as landscaping work to be carried out in conjunction with the development to improve its visual appearance. None of the trees within the existing site are protected.
67. The proposals would involve the removal of an existing early mature cedar tree (referred to as T2 on the submitted plans). The submitted details propose to replace the tree and would enable nearby trees to be retained and protection measures put in place while construction is carried out.
68. Officers are satisfied with the submitted arboricultural method statement and tree protection measures. Details relating to the underground services to be routed within Root Protection Areas (RPAs) can be dealt with by condition.
69. Planting is proposed around the borders of the and relating to the laybys areas, this would be at a low level which follows the advice provided by highways officers.
70. It is proposed to retain the existing Ginko tree at the entrance.
71. Officers recommend that the proposed landscaping works are acceptable.

Safety of Nitrogen Tank

72. Nitrogen is inert and non-flammable. The proposal is for a tank that would meet safety standards and would be enclosed with a fence. Officers have included a condition in the recommendation that has sought details of the enclosure and any signage associated with it.

Biodiversity

73. Officers have reviewed the findings of the ecologist's survey submitted with the application. The findings of the study are accepted although conditions are included with the recommendation which would require a repeat survey in the next twelve months, vegetation clearance to take place during March to August (to reduce impact on nesting birds) and to provide biodiversity enhancement measures.
74. The application site lies within half a mile of the New Marston Meadows SSSI. This is a grassland habitat close to the river Cherwell. Officers

consider that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the meadows.

Energy and Sustainability

75. Two reports have been submitted with the application that detail how improvements and alterations would be made to the existing building to make it more energy efficient and how the proposed extension would be built to include energy efficient and renewable energy generation. A condition has been included with the Officer recommendation to ensure that the recommendations and technologies included in the report are implemented as part of the approved development.

Noise

76. The proposed plans include a chiller located on the roof of the first floor and two plant rooms as shown in the proposed plant plans submitted with the application. Officers have considered the noise impact of this equipment, particularly in relation to the nearest residential occupiers. The nearest residential properties to the application site lie in Mansfield Road (approximately 150m away) and St Cross Road (110m away). The noise reports submitted with the application states that the plant has been designed to ensure that noise does not have a harmful impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential areas; specifically that noise from plant does not exceed 52dB at 3m from the equipment. A condition has been included as part of the Officer recommendation to ensure that this is the case.

Flooding and Surface Water Drainage

77. The application site does not lie within a defined area of high flood risk. A detailed flood risk assessment and drainage strategy have been submitted with the application. The proposed development would mainly be sited on existing impermeable surfaces and would not therefore give rise to a significant impact on surface water drainage on the application site.
78. Officers have included in the recommendation a condition that would require the specifications and methods included in those reports to be used throughout the development. This will ensure that the principals of SuDS will be complied with and the development will meet the requirements of Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy (2011).

Conclusion:

79. On the basis of the above, Officers recommend that members grant planning permission subject to the conditions included above.
Human Rights Act 1998

Officers have considered the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to conditions. Officers

have considered the potential interference with the rights of the owners/occupiers of surrounding properties under Article 8 and/or Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Act and consider that it is proportionate.

Officers have also considered the interference with the human rights of the applicant under Article 8 and/or Article 1 of the First Protocol caused by imposing conditions. Officers consider that the conditions are necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others and to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest. The interference is therefore justifiable and proportionate.

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

Officers have considered, with due regard, the likely effect of the proposal on the need to reduce crime and disorder as part of the determination of this application, in accordance with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. In reaching a recommendation to grant planning permission, officers consider that the proposal will not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community safety.

Background Papers:

15/03105/FUL

Contact Officer: Robert Fowler

Extension: 2104

Date: 17th November 2015

This page is intentionally left blank