

**SITES OF HORWOOD, LINDSAY AND BARNES HALLS, KEELE UNIVERSITY, KEELE
MR PHIL BUTTERS, KEELE UNIVERSITY**

18/00698/FUL

The application is for the demolition of 732 student bed-spaces and the erection of twenty new buildings to provide 1,685 student bedrooms (1,706 student bed-spaces) and social hub at Horwood and Lindsay Halls and the provision of car parking at Barnes and Horwood Halls.

The site lies within an area which on the Local Development Framework Proposals Map is excluded from the Green Belt but lies within an Area of Landscape Maintenance. Horwood and Barnes Halls and part of Lindsay Hall lie within the Grade II Registered Parkland and Garden of Special Historic Interest at Keele Hall. Horwood Hall lies outside the Keele Hall Conservation Area, but contiguous with it, and a very small part of Lindsay Hall lies within the Conservation Area. A number of the trees within the application site are covered by Tree Preservation Orders. A map showing the extent of the Keele Hall Conservation Area and another of the Registered Parkland and Garden will follow as Appendices to the report on this application.

The 13 week period for the determination of this application expires on the 4th December but an extension of the statutory period has been agreed by the applicant to 9th January 2019.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- A) Subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 obligation by 14th February 2019 to secure financial contributions towards travel plan monitoring (£2,360), the provision of real-time travel information (£15,000), and a Toucan signal controlled crossing on Cemetery Road (£39,000),

Permit, subject to conditions relating to the following matters:-

- Commencement time limit
 - Approved plans
 - Contaminated land
 - Construction management plan
 - External lighting scheme
 - Noise levels at residential units
 - Noise assessment for bars and social hubs
 - Noise levels from new external plant
 - Noise from internal plant and mechanical ventilation systems
 - Noise from energy centres and commercial activities
 - Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation
 - Details of surface water and foul sewage drainage
 - Provision of parking, servicing and turning areas indicated on approved plans
 - Cycle parking in accordance with approved details
 - Travel plan
 - Upon occupation, or at a later date if agreed, a review of the parking and modal split situation at the University to be undertaken, and such measures as shall be justified by the conclusions of that review, including if appropriate, the provision of additional or alternatively reduced parking, and management measures, to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its approval together with a timetable for the implementation of such measures, and thereafter their implementation
 - Tree protection plan and method statement
 - Details of special engineering within RPAs
 - Monitoring of construction works where by arboriculturalist where affecting trees
 - Landscaping scheme
 - Detailed information regarding the new pedestrian route and crossing at Keele Hall Drive
 - Facing and surfacing materials
 - Sample panels to be retained on site
- B) Should the above Section 106 obligations not be secured within the above period, that the Head of Planning be given delegated authority to refuse the application on the grounds that without such matters being secured the development would fail to secure measures to ensure that the development achieves sustainable development outcomes, and does not impact on highway safety: or, if he considers it appropriate, to extend the period of time within which the obligations can be secured.

Reason for Recommendations

The principle of residential accommodation within the University Campus is considered acceptable providing the students with accommodation very close to their place of study and the associated shops and services that the Campus offers. Subject to conditions and various Section 106 contributions which are considered necessary and lawful, the level of car parking initially proposed is considered acceptable although it is considered appropriate to require the position to be reviewed at the occupation of the development. The impact on trees is also considered acceptable. The scale, and the simple, well-mannered design of the buildings would be appropriate and it is not considered that there would be any significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Historic Park and Garden, the wider campus, or on the even wider landscape impact of the University. Subject to the imposition of suitable conditions it is not considered that there are any adverse impacts of the

development that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and accordingly permission should be granted.

Statement as to how the Local Planning Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner in dealing with the planning application

Additional information has been requested and provided where necessary to progress the determination of the application. This is now considered to be a sustainable form of development and complies with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Key Issues

1.1 The application is for the demolition of 732 student bed-spaces and the erection of twenty new buildings to provide 1,685 student bedrooms (1,706 student bed-spaces) and social hubs at Horwood and Lindsay Halls and the provision of car parking at Barnes and Horwood Halls.

1.2 The site lies within an area which on the Local Development Framework Proposals Map is excluded from the Green Belt but lies within an Area of Landscape Maintenance. Horwood and Barnes Halls and part of Lindsay Hall lie within the Grade II Registered Parkland and Garden of Special Historic Interest at Keele Hall. Horwood Hall lies outside the Keele Hall Conservation Area, but contiguous with it, and a very small part of Lindsay Hall lies within the Conservation Area.

1.3 Planning permission was granted in 2017 for student accommodation and other campus related uses at Barnes (Ref. 16/01014/FUL for 617 new bed-spaces), Lindsay (Ref. 16/01015/FUL for 814 new bed-spaces) and Horwood (Ref. 16/01016/FUL for 915 new bed-spaces).

1.4 The main issues for consideration in the determination of this application are:-

- Is the principle of the development acceptable?
- Does the proposed development have any adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the setting of any Listed Buildings or the character and appearance of the Historic Park and Garden?
- Is the location and design of the proposed development acceptable, including in the wider landscape context?
- Would there be any adverse impact on trees?
- Is the proposal acceptable in terms of its impact on highway safety and the level of car parking proposed?
- What planning obligations are considered necessary and lawful?
- Do the adverse impacts of the development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole?

2. Is the principle of the development on the site acceptable?

2.1 The application site lies within the University campus which is excluded from the Green Belt. As indicated above the proposal is primarily for residential accommodation.

2.2 The site is located within the Rural Area of Newcastle within the boundaries of the University Campus. Core Spatial Strategy (CSS) Policy SP1 states that new housing will be primarily directed towards sites within Newcastle Town Centre, neighbourhoods with General Renewal Areas and Areas of Major Intervention, and within the identified significant urban centres. It goes on to say that new development will be prioritised in favour of previously developed land where it can support sustainable patterns of development and provides access to services and service centres by foot, public transport and cycling.

2.3 CSS Policy ASP6 on the Rural Area states that there will be a maximum of 900 net additional dwellings of high design quality primarily located on sustainable brownfield land within the village envelopes of the key Rural Service Centres, namely Loggerheads, Madeley and the villages of Audley Parish, to meet identified local requirements, in particular, the need for affordable housing.

2.4 Saved Policy NLP H1 indicates that planning permission will only be given where one of a number of circumstances are satisfied including if the site is within the urban area of Newcastle or Kidsgrove or within one of the 'village envelopes'. This site does not satisfy any of the requirements listed.

2.5 As indicated above this site is not within the urban area or a village envelope nor would the proposed units serve an identified local need as defined in the CSS. As such its development for residential purposes is not supported by housing policies in the Development Plan. However the CSS Policy SP1 goes on to say that investment in Keele University and Science Park will be fostered to help strengthen the local knowledge and skills base and facilitate the growth and competitiveness of high value business development, thereby increasing local job opportunities in these sectors.

2.6 Only a small part of the site (at Barnes) lies within the area covered by NLP Policy E8 which relates to development at Keele University and Keele Science Park, but the principles of this policy are considered relevant. This policy indicates that development will be permitted so long as it is limited to one or more of the uses specified within it. Such uses include staff and student residences and therefore the proposal accords with the requirements of this policy.

2.7 CSS Policy SP2 lists Spatial Principles of Economic Development and includes investment in Keele University and Keele Science Park.

2.8 In approving the previous student accommodation schemes for the campus, the Local Planning Authority accepted that the site was in a suitable location for residential development (in terms of access to services and facilities). Newcastle Town Centre is approximately 3km from the site and although the route back from the Town Centre to the site is up hill, it is considered that at least some students would be able to walk to the shops and services of Newcastle Town Centre with regular bus services to destinations around the borough, and beyond. There is, at least during term time, a very high frequency bus service connecting Keele with Newcastle bus station, the hospital, the railway station and the City Centre. Importantly the dwellings are to be developed within the University Campus providing the students with accommodation very close to their place of study and the associated shops and services that the Campus offers.

2.9 Since the previous schemes were considered a revised NPPF has been published (July 2018). There is nothing in the revised NPPF to suggest that there is a basis for the Local Planning Authority to reconsider its position on this issue and therefore, noting the acceptance in 2017 that the development is in a sustainable location (in terms of access to services and facilities), there is no substantive basis for coming to a different view on this point now.

2.10 At the time of determining the previous applications for this site, the Council was unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, however it is the case that the Council is now able to demonstrate a five year supply of specific deliverable housing sites, with the appropriate buffer, with a supply of 5.45 years as at the 1st April 2018. Given this, it is appropriate to consider the proposal in the context of the policies contained within the approved Development Plan.

2.11 The principle of residential accommodation within the University Campus is considered acceptable providing the students with accommodation very close to their place of study and the associated shops and services that the Campus offers.

3. Does the proposed development have any adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the setting of any Listed Buildings or the character and appearance of the Historic Park and Garden?

3.1 Horwood and Barnes Halls and part of Lindsay Hall lie within the Grade II Registered Parkland and Garden of Special Historic Interest at Keele Hall. Horwood Hall lies outside the Keele Hall Conservation Area, but contiguous with it, and a very small part of Lindsay Hall lies within the Conservation Area. Keele Hall, a Grade II* Listed Building lies to the south-west of Horwood Hall.

3.2 There is a statutory duty upon the LPA to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings in the exercise

of its planning functions. There is no such statutory duty with respect to the Registered Parkland and Garden. Local and national planning policies seek to protect and enhance their character and appearance of all of such features and development that is contrary to those aims will be resisted.

3.3 The NPPF states that 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.

3.4 Paragraph 193 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset such as a Conservation Area, Listed Building or Registered Park and Garden, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

3.5 In Paragraph 195 it is indicated that where a proposed development would 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 total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:-

- The nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- No viable use of heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- Conservation by grant funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- The harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use

3.6 Paragraph 196 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

3.7 Saved NLP Policy B5 states that the Council will resist development proposals that would adversely affect the setting of a Listed Building.

3.8 NLP Policy B9 states that the Council will resist development that would harm the special architectural or historic character or appearance of Conservation Areas. Policy B14 states that in determining applications for building in or adjoining a Conservation Area, special regard will be paid to the acceptability or otherwise of its form, scale and design when related to the character of its setting, including, particularly, the buildings and open spaces in the vicinity. These policies are all consistent with the NPPF and the weight to be given to them should reflect this.

3.9 Overall, the Council's Conservation Officer states that the scheme is well thought out and aims to minimise the effect on the Historic Park and Garden and Conservation Area, including the listed buildings within the parkland. The Conservation Advisory Working Party (CAWP) considers that the scheme is overall more sympathetic and restrained than the previous scheme. No objections are raised to the car park at Barnes.

3.10 A number of trees are to be lost from the Historic Parkland as a result of the development. The impact of their loss will be considered in Section 5 below.

Horwood

3.11 The development at Horwood comprises two substantial blocks (Horwood A & B) on the former car park site opposite the Student Union, a 10-storey tower to replace the existing tower and a mix of 3 and 4 storey townhouses. A number of existing blocks would be demolished.

3.12 Horwood is adjacent to the north-eastern boundary of the Keele Hall Conservation Area which includes the Grade II* listed Keele Hall. The Heritage Statement submitted with the application states that the proposed buildings on Horwood would introduce replacement buildings on land already developed for university campus purposes and that the buildings would not introduce a use or built form that is out of character within the existing, immediate context of the Conservation Area. It goes on to highlight that the Conservation Area is well defined along its boundary with Horwood by dense woodland and vegetation so inter-visibility is limited.

3.13 With regard to the development at Horwood, the Conservation Officer states that the intentional relationship of Keele Hall with the landscape remains unaffected by the proposal and considers that Horwood A and B will be a successful new addition to the campus with its active frontage opposite the Student Union and the creation of new attractive spaces. The re-creation of the tower at Horwood is supported.

3.14 Whilst significant in height, Horwood A and B would be sited close to the existing heart of the campus and the highest block would not exceed the height of the existing tree canopy. This part of the site is sufficiently far enough away from Keele Hall not to compete with it and it is not considered that any objection could be sustained on the grounds of impact on the character of the Historic Park and Garden. The Heritage Statement considers that visibility of the proposed tower within key views through the most historically intact areas of the Park would not be possible and the original intentional designs and views through the landscape would be conserved. It states that whilst the tower would be glimpsed above the canopy of the woodland bank that encloses the Conservation Area when the trees are not in leaf, these views are not key views and it is not considered that it would substantially affect the significance of the Park.

3.15 Your Officer considers that given the existing development at Horwood and the significant landscaping between the Hall and the Conservation Area, there would be no significant adverse impact from the Horwood development on the setting of Keele Hall, the Conservation Area or the Historic Park and Garden.

Lindsay

3.16 The development at Lindsay comprises two blocks of townhouses (Lindsay V & W) to the north of the site adjacent to Lindsay Court, a set of three linked blocks to the east extending south through the site (Lindsay X), being four-storeys at the northern end and seven-storeys at the southern (lower) end with a flat roof, and a four-storey block to the south (Lindsay U).

3.17 The Design and Access Statement states that Lindsay Block X is parallel to the historic garden wall and is positioned to reinforce this strong boundary. It becomes the eastern 'wall' for Lindsay with terraced, lower-rise townhouses within the central spaces creating smaller, linked courtyards. It is stated that the 'wall' that Block X forms picks up on the historic openings and links in the garden wall and existing Lindsay Court Halls.

3.18 Keele Hall and the Clock House Listed Buildings lie to the east of Lindsay Hall but the historic relationship between the Listed Buildings and the walled gardens has been impacted upon by the existing development at Lindsay Hall and it is considered that the proposed development would have no greater impact on the setting of those Listed Buildings than is currently the case.

3.19 Lindsay Hall lies on the western edge of the Conservation Area, the boundary of which includes a very small sliver of land within the application site alongside the western wall of the upper garden. The remainder of the site forms part of the setting of the Conservation Area, but is not within it.

3.20 There is no published Conservation Area Appraisal but the Heritage Assessment states that the existing development has had a negative impact on the Conservation Area and its setting. It asserts that the impact of the proposal on the significance of the Conservation Area would be 'slight adverse'.

3.21 The Lindsay Hall site lies partly within the boundary of the Historic Park and Garden and partly within its setting. The Heritage Statement states that the existing accommodation blocks at Lindsay are not considered to benefit the character of the registered park or its setting and form negative

elements in short views westwards through the park from the former carriage route elevated above the lower walled garden. It is asserted that the proposed redevelopment of Lindsay would result in a lower-density built form of a higher quality design that is honest in its increased scale and prominence. The Heritage Statement argues that whilst visible in views through and into the registered park, the site does not comprise features or elements of the historic landscape that meaningfully enhance the significance of the park. Given the nature of the extant buildings at Lindsay, the overall impact of the proposals on the significance of the park would be 'slight' adverse with the detailed materials and finishes and landscaping offering opportunities to mitigate harm through enhanced built and landscape design.

3.22 The approach taken at Lindsay is supported by the Conservation Officer who states that Block X creates an interesting massing within the landscape and crucially is confined to the top section of the site reducing the impact on the southerly edge of the park and garden in this location.

3.23 Your Officer notes that although there are remnants of key parts of the designated landscape, it is exceptionally fragmented, particularly by early development of the University. University buildings are already visible from within and into the designed landscape and the existing Lindsay Hall has already caused disruption as have the farmbuildings and to a lesser degree Larchwood. The proposed development which would be informed by the historic layout and containment of the original walled garden would create some order and better designed buildings and spaces. It is considered that in the context of the existing development and given the thoughtful and well-mannered design and layout which has been informed by the historic landscape, the proposed development at Lindsay would not have any adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the setting of any Listed Buildings or the character and appearance of the Historic Park and Garden.

4. Is the location and design of the proposed development acceptable, including in the wider landscape context?

4.1 The site is within an Area of Landscape Maintenance as designated on the Local Development Framework Proposals Map and Policy N19 of the Local Plan states that within these areas it will be necessary to demonstrate that development will not erode the character or harm the quality of the landscape. This policy is considered to be consistent with the NPPF which states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.

Horwood

4.2 The Horwood site lies towards the centre of the University campus and just south of the northwest to southeast orientated ridgeline that crosses central parts of the campus. The site falls quite steeply to the southwest. The existing accommodation blocks and student townhouses comprise modern, red brick buildings with flat roofs to the accommodation blocks and pitched roofs to the student housing. The accommodation blocks are confined to the lowest parts of the site where they are mostly 3-storeys high although one block (the tower) in the centre of the site is 7-storeys.

4.3 The proposed development at Horwood comprises two substantial blocks (Horwood A & B) which are 5-6 storeys in height with a reception and hub proposed at ground floor level. Central to the block is an enclosed landscaped courtyard and an external terrace and potential social space is also proposed to the Keele Hall Drive elevation. A new pedestrian route is proposed to the west of the building which aligns with a new crossing point to connect with the Student Union building. Horwood Block C would replace the existing tower with a 10-storey tower located in the same position. The facades would be stepped in and out to emphasise the slender proportions and articulate the depth of the elevations with shadowing. The top two levels of the tower would be stepped back to top the tower off with reduced footprint. The existing accommodation to the east of the tower would be demolished and replaced by Horwood Blocks D-P. The proposals include three groups of buildings centred around a courtyard which would comprise car parking.

4.4 Similar design details would be used throughout the development but with different bricks used to emphasise the individual characters of the different halls. Horwood A & B would be primarily brick with glazed curtain walling to the south elevation at Hub level. It is proposed to use blue brindle bricks and

a contrasting pale brick to provide a strong reference to the Chapel and other buildings on the campus and brickwork recesses are proposed to the central blocks to reflect the pattern of window openings in the Chapel. The Horwood tower and townhouses would comprise facing brickwork with metal standing seam to the roofs and matching metal surrounds to the dormers.

4.5 Both the Conservation Officer and CAWP have raised concerns regarding the heavily suburban and uniform nature of the smaller groups of townhouses with steeply pitched roofs and chimneys which would be a prominent feature given the lack of this kind of development historically on campus. CAWP wish that consideration is given to variation of roofs with maybe occasional monopitches and reducing the angle of the pitches. The application states that the steep roofs are designed to give an elegant and composed character related to Keele Hall roofs. Whilst comprising traditional steep roofs, the design of the townhouses with window surrounds to the top floors, recesses at ground floor and crisp lines would give a more contemporary finish. Given the existing development at Horwood and the mix of designs on the Campus as a whole, it is considered that the proposals would be acceptable.

4.6 Urban Vision Design Review Panel (UVDRP) states that the provision of a new pedestrian route and crossing point to the west of Horwood Block A and B to create a stronger physical and visual connection with the existing Student Union Building is welcomed. The approach to the proposed tower is supported and the axis of the building to align with pedestrian routes is considered to be positive, aiding legibility. The Panel considered that the appearance and materials, whilst providing visual interest, are restrained, well-mannered and sit well with the proposed neighbouring townhouse blocks. The Panel considered the structural layout of the site to be improved, the form and proportion of the townhouses to work well and the limited material palette appropriate for the site context. UVDRP recommended that detailed information be submitted regarding the new pedestrian route and crossing at Keele Hall Drive and that further information be provided relating to the landscaping and levels of Blocks D-P.

4.7 There is existing built development and substantial vegetation surrounding the Horwood site which ensures that there would be no impact on the wider landscape. Existing perimeter vegetation will be retained and together with vegetation and buildings that adjoin the site, views of the new buildings from within the University and immediate surrounding area will be substantially filtered and screened. Overall your Officer considers that the scale, and the simple, well-mannered design of the buildings at Horwood would be appropriate and it is not considered that there would be any significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the wider campus, or on the even wider landscape impact of the University.

Lindsay

4.8 The Lindsay application site lies south of the ridgeline that crosses central parts of the campus and runs parallel to the southern boundary of the built campus. The site falls quite steeply to the south southwest. The existing accommodation blocks towards the eastern and southern extent of the site comprise modern, yellow brick buildings with flat and pitched roofs that range in height from 2 to 4-storeys. At the northern higher end of the site are a number of older buildings of varying styles and materials, but of modern appearance.

4.9 The proposed development at Lindsay Hall comprises four blocks. Block U is located to the south of the site and would be 3-storeys with 4th storey 'pop-ups' and Blocks V and W would each be 4-storeys in height. Block X would comprise a set of 3 blocks with individual entrances providing shared facilities clusters. A shared vehicular and pedestrian route is to be provided through the lower level of Block X to link to existing car park Q. The townhouse blocks would have the same internal and external design as those at Horwood. Block X is parallel to the historic garden wall and the Design & Access Statement states that it is positioned to reinforce this strong boundary and create a new space in the area formed between the two. Block X becomes the eastern 'wall' for Lindsay with terraced, lower-rise townhouse within the central spaces creating smaller linked courtyards. It is asserted that the 'wall' that Block X forms picks up on the historic openings and links in the garden wall and existing Lindsay Court Halls.

4.10 Each individual element of Block X steps its bottom level down the site following the natural topography whereas the top roof level is a consistent level. By following the site's gradient and

stepping the blocks up the site, the tallest block is at the bottom but the Design & Access Statement asserts that due to its slim end proportions and detailing, the block is not overwhelming or dominating to the surrounding area. The top floor steps in to reduce the mass and overall feeling of height visible at the lower levels and the front elevation steps in and out.

4.11 A lighter buff-coloured brick is proposed to complement the red brick of Lindsay Court and the very yellowish buff brick of the blocks in the lower part of the site which will now remain. The smaller blocks will use the same metal standing seam and metal surround details as the townhouses at Horwood.

4.12 Urban Vision welcomed the design approach and articulation of Block X but raised some concerns regarding its massing and scale and the Panel recommended that additional information be provided to demonstrate how the development responds to the special character and historic features of Lindsay Hall site.

4.13 Your Officer considers that the scale and design of the proposed buildings at Lindsay Hall would be appropriate. In comparison to the previously approved scheme for this site (Ref. 16/01015/FUL) the tall block is set back away from the southern boundary of the University, making it less prominent in the landscape. In conclusion, it is not considered that the proposed scheme would have any significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the wider campus, or on the even wider landscape impact of the University.

5. Would there be any adverse impact on trees?

5.1 There are a significant number of mature trees on and around the sites of the proposed halls. A number of the trees within the application site are covered by Tree Preservation Orders. The Landscape Development Section (LDS) objects to the proposals on the grounds that all of the existing trees within the central areas of the Horwood and Lindsay sites are shown to be removed, including category 'A' (high value) and 'B' (moderate value) trees. It is considered that this removal of mature trees will erode the parkland character of the campus and although tree planting is proposed to mitigate this loss it will take many decades to grow sufficiently. In addition, the LDS expresses concern that the proposed levels drawings seem to show that Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of retained trees on site boundaries will be affected by levels changes. Particular concern is expressed regarding 2 important trees on the Horwood site (T60 and T78) and two groups on the Lindsay site (G37 and G38).

5.2 The applicant responded with a Technical Note that stated that the existing topography is challenging across the campus and the need to tie into the surrounding areas, structures, adjacent highways and woodland belts whilst providing access for service vehicles, emergency services and accessible routes around the buildings, has resulted in the loss of a number of mature trees. The Technical Note also claims that the levels within the RPAs of T60, T78, G37 and G38 will not be affected.

5.3 The levels information submitted with the application appears to show that there will be impact within the RPAs of those trees and therefore your Officer sought further information on levels with particular reference to T60 and T78 which appear to be the most affected. A Note has been submitted that concludes that the proposed layout physically permits the retention of those trees without the need for branch or root pruning and without creating a future management burden. All new surfacing within the RPA of both trees can be installed to a no-dig and permeable design. The Note asserts that there are no proposed level changes within the RPA of T78 and those proposed around T60 diminish as they approach the tree and do not encroach closer than 3m from the trunk. It is submitted that the use of a granular fill material or the use of a suspended platform will ensure that conditions vital to the healthy function of tree roots are maintained.

5.4 The LDS does not consider that the additional information is satisfactory and it has not enabled a full assessment of the impact on the trees. It is not possible to say with any certainty that the two trees, T60 and T78 will be able to be retained.

5.5. Although it is the case that a number of trees would be removed from the site, some of which are Category 'A' and 'B' trees, the significant variation in levels across both Horwood and Lindsay Halls means that development is challenging and unfortunately the loss of some trees appears inevitable. Although the historic maps show key groups of trees in areas such as between Keele Hall and Horwood and along Observatory Walk adjacent to the former car park at Horwood, the trees to be lost do not appear to be a key component of the planned landscape. The loss of existing trees will be mitigated by new tree planting and although the new planting will take time to mature, given the overall importance of this development to the University's strategic growth ambitions, on balance, the tree loss is considered acceptable.

6. Is the proposal acceptable in terms of its impact on highway safety and the level of car parking proposed?

6.1 Information regarding the transport aspects of the application is contained within the Transport Statements and the Planning, Design & Access Statement. The redevelopment of the Horwood site will result in the provision of 140 car parking spaces with an additional 155 spaces located within the new car park on the Barnes site. No additional parking spaces are proposed at any of the Lindsay residential blocks. Overall, no change in total University parking provision is proposed.

6.2 The NPPF, at paragraph 109, states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network are severe. In March 2015 the Secretary of State gave a statement on maximum parking standards indicating that the government is keen to ensure that there is adequate parking provision both in new residential developments and around town centres and high streets. Policy T16 of the Local Plan, adopted in 2003, states that development will not be permitted to provide more parking than the levels set out in an appendix and also that development which provides significantly less parking than the maximum specified levels will not be permitted if this would create or aggravate a local on-street parking or traffic problem, and furthermore that development may be permitted where local on-street problems can be overcome by measures to improve non-car modes of travel to the site and/or measures to control parking and waiting in nearby streets.

6.3 In terms of trip generation, the Transport Statements state that the proposals are not anticipated to have a material impact or give rise to any highway related issues. They conclude that the proposed developments would be able to be accommodated onto the local highway network and that there is no evidence to suggest that the proposals would have an adverse effect on road safety or the number of accidents in the vicinity.

6.4 The proposed development would result in an additional 974 residents on the campus but no additional car parking spaces are proposed. The Transport Statements highlight the University's Student Parking Scheme which states that students that are resident on campus are not permitted to bring a car to campus unless they are disabled or studying specified courses which require attendance on placements off campus. There are many facilities on the campus and there is a very good bus service between the campus and the town centre, all of which would influence students to leave any vehicle they may have at home. Those who live off campus are entitled to purchase a permit to park a car on certain designated car parks on payment of an approved charge.

6.5 The Transport Statements state that the proposals encourage sustainable travel by creating routes for pedestrians and cyclists that will link the accommodation with the surrounding Campus and amenities. The proposals also incorporate a commitment to prepare and implement a Travel Plan to maximise the uptake of walking and cycling and covered cycle parking spaces will be provided in a number of locations. As referred to earlier in the report, it is considered that the campus is in a relatively sustainable location within, at least for some, walking distance of the shops and services of Newcastle Town Centre with its regular bus services to destinations around the borough, and beyond. As already indicated there is, at least during term time, a very high frequency bus service connecting Keele with Newcastle bus station, the hospital, the railway station and the City Centre.

6.6 The Highway Authority has no objections to the proposals subject to a number of conditions and Section 106 contributions.

6.7 It is the case that although issues of the level of car parking provision for these developments might in the first instance appear to be matters that do not affect safety on the public highway in that they are internal issues for the University to manage in terms of its own estate, the amount and management of parking available on the campus as a whole does have a wider impact on locations where drivers can and will, in the absence of controls, park and walk in from. Significant on-street parking associated with the University is occurring beyond the campus.

6.8 In considering the previous accommodation proposals for the Campus, it was considered necessary to impose conditions to address the potential impact of the University's parking position on the position outside the campus. Completion of the temporary car park (granted planning permission under Ref. 17/00012/FUL) was required prior to commencement of development and a review of parking arrangements was required following completion of the scheme to ensure that a suitable number of spaces are maintained in the longer term. The temporary car park has been constructed and that will help to ensure sufficient car parking provision during construction but it remains the view of your Officer that it is reasonable to require a review of the parking and modal split situation at the University to be undertaken following occupation of the development.

7. What planning obligations are considered necessary and lawful?

7.1 Section 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations states that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:

- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- Directly related to the development; and
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

7.2 The Highway Authority requests a number of financial contributions towards travel plan monitoring, a toucan signal controlled crossing on Cemetery Road and Traveline (the development of real time travel information data feed for mobile phones). These are considered to accord with the CIL Regulations.

APPENDIX 1

Policies and proposals in the approved development plan relevant to this decision:-

[Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy \(CSS\) 2006-2026](#)

Policy SP1	Spatial Principles of Targeted Regeneration
Policy SP2	Spatial Principles of Economic Development
Policy SP3	Spatial Principles of Movement and Access
Policy ASP6	Rural Area Spatial Policy
Policy CSP1	Design Quality
Policy CSP2	Historic Environment
Policy CSP3	Sustainability and Climate Change
Policy CSP4	Natural Assets
Policy CSP5	Open Space/Sport/Recreation
Policy CSP10	Planning Obligations

[Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan \(NLP\) 2011](#)

Policy H1	Residential Development: Sustainable Location and Protection of the Countryside
Policy E8	Keele University and Keele Science Park
Policy N3	Development and Nature Conservation – Protection and Enhancement Measures
Policy N4	Development and Nature Conservation – Use of Local Species
Policy N12	Development and the Protection of Trees
Policy N13	Felling and Pruning of Trees
Policy N17	Landscape Character – General Considerations
Policy N19	Landscape Maintenance Areas
Policy T16	Development – General Parking Requirements
Policy C4	Open Space in New Housing Areas
Policy IM1	Provision of Essential Supporting Infrastructure and Community Facilities

Other Material Considerations include:

[National Planning Policy](#)

[National Planning Policy Framework \(NPPF\) \(2018\)](#)

[Planning Practice Guidance \(March 2014\)](#)

[Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations \(2010\)](#) as amended and related statutory guidance

[Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents](#)

[Developer contributions SPD \(September 2007\)](#)

[Space Around Dwellings SPG \(SAD\) \(July 2004\)](#)

[Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document \(2010\)](#)

[Planning for Landscape Change - SPG to the former Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan](#)

[Waste Management and Recycling Planning Practice Guidance Note](#) approved in 2003 and last updated in February 2016

Relevant Planning History

- 10/00531/FUL Construction of student accommodation blocks at Keele University Campus (Barnes and Horwood) and residential development and an older persons care village at The Hawthorns - withdrawn on 7th March 2011
- 13/00424/FUL Proposed student accommodation with car parking at Keele Campus (Barnes) and residential development of 92 dwellings with school drop off point, shop and linked area of green space at The Hawthorns – Refused and dismissed at appeal in July 2015
- 16/01004/FUL Demolition of the Management Centre buildings at the Hawthorns, Keele and the construction of student accommodation at Keele University Campus (Barnes) and residential development at The Hawthorns, Keele – Approved
- 16/01014/FUL Demolition of 366 student bed-spaces and the erection of seven new halls of residence comprising four cluster flat blocks and three townhouse blocks to provide 617 new student bed-spaces, three wardens' flats and two laundries; the erection of a single-storey social hub; the erection of a new energy centre; the erection of ancillary buildings including bike stores and bin stores; the reconfiguration of parking, servicing and accesses; plus hard and soft landscaping, engineering works and associated infrastructure at Barnes Hall – Approved
- 16/01015/FUL Demolition of an energy centre, music studio and 241 student bed-spaces and other demolition works; the erection of 10 new halls of residence, comprising seven cluster flat blocks and three townhouse blocks to provide 814 new student bed-spaces, three wardens' flats, three laundries, a social hub in two locations; the erection of a replacement energy centre; the erection of ancillary buildings including bike stores and bin stores; the reconfiguration of parking, servicing and accesses; plus hard and soft landscaping, engineering works and associated infrastructure at Lindsay Hall – Approved
- 16/01016/FUL Demolition of 266 student bed-space and other demolition works; the erection of 13 new halls of residence, comprising seven cluster flat blocks and six townhouse blocks to provide 915 new student bed-spaces, three wardens' flats and three laundries; the provision of a music and teaching facility and a replacement medical facility; the erection of a two-storey social hub; the erection of ancillary buildings including bike stores and bin stores; the change of use of 'House 99' to the Keele Postgraduate Association building; the reconfiguration of parking, servicing and accesses; plus hard and soft landscaping, engineering works and associated infrastructure at Horwood Hall – Approved
- 17/00012/FUL Creation of temporary car park and associated works - Approved

Views of Consultees

Historic England does not wish to offer any comments.

The **Council's Conservation Officer** makes the following comments:

- The scheme is well thought out and aims to minimise the effect on the historic park and garden and Conservation Area, including the listed buildings within the parkland. The intentional relationship of Keele Hall with the landscape remains unaffected by the proposal, particularly unobstructed and uninterrupted views south-east and south-west from the hall, allowing for far reaching views beyond the parkland. The impact statements within the heritage statement are generally accepted.
- Horwood A and B will be a successful new addition to the campus and its approach and massing is appropriate in the context. The active frontage will open out this area and create new attractive spaces. The re-creation of the tower at Horwood is supported and it is pleasing

that there is no large scale development further north and this approach seems less dense than the previous scheme.

- Some concerns are raised over the heavily suburban nature of the smaller groups of terraced houses with steeply pitched roofs and chimneys which are a prominent feature given the lack of this kind of development historically on campus.
- All of the new buildings at Horwood and Lindsay are proposing replacement buildings on land already developed for the campus so principally are not inherently harmful to the character of the parkland or setting of the Conservation Area given the lack of inter-visibility.
- The approach taken at Lindsay is supported and the larger tenement style townhouses work within the context. The hall block creates an interesting massing within the landscape and crucially is confined to the top section reducing the impact of the larger scale building on the southerly edge of the Park and Garden in this location.
- There will be limited small scale harm created to the heritage assets and to their settings. Views into and out of the Conservation Area will be protected by large banks of trees and therefore there will only ever be glimpses of buildings which will be seen in the context of the campus environment.
- No objections are raised to the car park at Barnes.

The **Gardens Trust** has considered the information provided in support of the application and does not wish to comment on the proposals at this stage. It is emphasised that this does not in any way signify either their approval or disapproval of the proposals.

The **Conservation Advisory Working Party** – the scheme is overall more sympathetic and restrained than the previous scheme. They raised concerns regarding the possible brick at Horwood A & B being too dark and a little oppressive and recommended that there is a balance of colours and materials within the design. Regarding Horwood, concerns were raised over the uniformity of the layout and the very steep roof pitches on the townhouses which may date and are a very alien feature within the campus. They wished consideration to be given to variation of roofs with maybe occasional monopitches and reducing the angle of the pitches. Regarding Lindsay they asked for clarification on the cladding of the townhouses and suggested that more earthy colours were used rather than a buff brick. The Working Party also commented that they wished the provision of disabled rooms not to be grouped in one place but spread around the campus.

Staffordshire County Council Rural County (Environmental Advice) Team – No further archaeological mitigation required for Horwood and Barnes Halls but a programme of archaeological recording is required for a defined area of Lindsay Hall. A condition is recommended requiring a Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation for that area.

The **Environmental Health Division** – no objections subject to conditions regarding a construction environmental management plan, provision of kitchen ventilation systems and odour abatement, external lighting scheme, noise levels at residential units, noise assessment for bars and social hubs, noise levels from new external plant, noise from internal plant and mechanical ventilation systems, noise from energy centres and commercial activities, and contaminated land.

The **Landscape Development Section** – objects to the layout for the following reasons:

- It is disappointing that there has been no concession for existing trees growing within the central areas of the Horwood and Lindsay sites and no attempt appears to have been made to retain any. All except those shown on the boundaries are shown to be removed, including category 'A' and 'B' trees. The Design and Access Statement refers to three sycamore trees retained in the most northern courtyard of Horwood but this appears not to be the case.
- This removal of mature trees, including those that existed prior to the current buildings being built, will erode the parkland character of the campus and although tree planting is proposed to mitigate this loss it will take many decades to grow sufficiently. Trees planted as part of the original development in the mid-20th century are only just beginning to reach their full potential.

Further comments are as follows:

- The proposed levels drawings seem to show that RPAs of retained trees on site boundaries will be affected by levels changes. Particular concern is expressed regarding 2 important trees on the Horwood site and two groups above the proposed retaining wall to the north of Block X on the Lindsay site. There are others where levels should be amended to accommodate trees to BS5837: 2012. It is requested that trees shown to be removed from boundaries should, with layout amendments, be retained if possible.
- A pre-contract Tree Protection Plan is required to demonstrate that the retained trees will not be harmed. This should show areas for special engineering and remedial works within RPAs and include for proposed drainage and underground services. The RPAs of retained trees have not been included on the Tree Works plans and for clarity these should be added.
- No objection in principle is raised to the strategic landscaping proposals subject to submission of a detailed landscaping scheme. Existing retained trees shown on the plans do not appear to be consistent with those shown in the tree report and the scheme should be revised accordingly.

The **Local Lead Flood Authority** – No objections subject to a condition regarding submission of a detailed surface water drainage design.

The **Highway Authority** has no objections subject to conditions regarding the provision of parking, servicing and turning areas, provision of cycle parking, implementation of travel plan and the submission of a Construction Management Plan. Section 106 contributions are required towards travel plan monitoring, a toucan signal controlled crossing on Cemetery Road and Traveline (the development of real time travel information data feed for mobile phones).

Keele Parish Council agreed that as students are not allowed to bring cars onto campus, there would be no further impact on parking. It was noted that additional parking is to be provided.

Natural England raises no objections and states that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected sites and landscapes.

Cadent Gas states that there is apparatus in the vicinity which may be affected by the proposal and therefore the contractor should contact Plant Protection before any works are carried out to ensure the apparatus is not affected by the works.

Severn Trent Water has no objections subject to a condition requiring drainage plans for the disposal of foul and surface water flows.

The **Environment Agency** has assessed the application as having low environmental risk.

Staffordshire County Council as the **Mineral and Waste Planning Authority** has no comments to make on the application.

No comments have been received from the **Council's Waste Section, Staffordshire Wildlife Trust** and **Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust**, the date by which their comments were requested has passed without comments being received from them and they must be assumed to have no observations to make.

Representations

None received

Applicant's/Agent's submission

The application is accompanied by the following documents:

- Planning, Design and Access Statement
- Transport Statement
- Travel Plan
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Air Quality Assessment

- Energy Strategy
- Acoustic Planning Report
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
- Bat Survey Report
- Landscape & Visual Assessment
- Heritage Statement
- Archaeological Desk Based Assessment
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- Phase 1 Geo-environmental Desk Study
- Statement of Community Engagement

All of these documents are available for inspection at the Guildhall and as associated documents to the application in the Planning Section of the Council's website via the following link <http://publicaccess.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk/online-applications/PLAN/18/00698/FUL>

Background papers

Planning files referred to
Planning Documents referred to

Date report prepared

17th December 2018