<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PLANNING COMMITTEE</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date: 18th June 2008</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>08/0337/FUL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Received</strong></td>
<td><strong>10th March 2008</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Date</strong></td>
<td><strong>9th June 2008</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward</strong></td>
<td><strong>Trumpington</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site</strong></td>
<td><strong>St Faiths School Trumpington Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 8AG</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Erection of multi-purpose sports hall to accommodate 4 badminton courts and associated changing rooms, together with a reconfigured car park/outdoor play facility and associated works (following demolition of existing building).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td><strong>St Faiths School C/o York House Dukes Court 54-62 Newmarket Road Cambridge CB5 8DZ</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 St. Faith’s School is a preparatory school occupying a 4.35 hectare site on the eastern side of Trumpington Road with Newton Road to the north and east and Meadow Croft and Rayleigh Close to the south.

1.2 This application relates to that part of the site which faces onto Newton Road and is currently occupied by a tall single storey, pitch roofed brick built gymnasium, measuring 7.8 metres to the maximum ridge height, positioned 6 metres from the highway verge to the north, with a lower single storey part corrugated steel structure that links the gym to Newton House but projects forward of the main building by 2 metres. To the east of the existing building is an open hard surfaced area measuring 36 metres by 18 metres. This area is utilised as a drop off area for parents during school opening and closing hours but is also used as an amenity area for sporting activities.

1.3 The site is allocated as protected open space in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) under policy 4/2.
1.4 There is a tree preservation order on the site protecting a row of Lime trees along the northern boundary fronting onto Newton Road.

1.5 The site is not located within a City of Cambridge Conservation Area, nor are any of the buildings on the St. Faith’s School site listed. The site falls outside the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of a multi-purpose sports hall to accommodate four badminton courts and associated changing rooms. This follows the demolition of the existing gymnasium and the reconfiguration of an area of hard standing which currently stands to the east of the existing gymnasium which serves as a car park and outdoor play facility.

2.2 To the south of the proposed sports hall is a large playing field designated as open space under policy 4/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). This accommodates an under 11s Cricket pitch, 200 metre running track and football pitch. Due to the encroachment of the proposed sports hall onto the existing playing field it is proposed that the existing cricket pitch, 200metre running track and football pitch be marginally repositioned so that these uses may be retained.

2.3 The application also seeks consent for a temporary access, 5 metres in width to the north east of the site off Newton Road to access an extended car parking area along the eastern boundary as to retain the 24 car parking spaces on site which currently exist on the hardstanding to the east of the existing gymnasium. This is so that pick up and drop off by parents at the beginning and end of the day may continue while demolition and construction works take place. Post construction 14 spaces will be retained on the existing hard standing area with 10 spaces along the eastern side of the access into the playing field retained from the construction phase permanently. The original, existing access used to enter and leave this area will then be used and the temporary access to the far north east of the site will be removed.

2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
3.0 SITE HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C/67/0715/OUT</td>
<td>Extension to school for form additional classroom, new science laboratories, hall etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/68/0456</td>
<td>Extension to existing private school - St. Faith's School, Trumpington Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/69/0426</td>
<td>New Assembly Hall to replace existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/70/0729</td>
<td>Cloakroom and changing room extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/78/0983</td>
<td>Erection of No. 2 classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/80/0782</td>
<td>Erection of two-storey classroom block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/83/0416</td>
<td>Alterations and extensions to existing school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/83/0608</td>
<td>Alterations and extensions to existing building to form sports hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/90/0610</td>
<td>Alterations to form library and reading room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/91/0183</td>
<td>Extension to headmasters house (single storey rear extension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/97/0162</td>
<td>Erection of a two storey building to provide teaching accommodation (Class C2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/04/0429</td>
<td>Erection of new music, design and technology centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement: Yes
Adjoining Owners: Yes
Site Notice Displayed: Yes
DC Forum (meeting of 30\textsuperscript{th} April 2008): Yes
Consultative Disability Panel (meeting of 14\textsuperscript{th} May 2008) Yes

4.2 The minutes of the public meeting/DC Forum are attached to this report.

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central Government Advice

5.2 PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development (2005):
Paragraphs 7 and 8 state that national policies and regional and local development plans (regional spatial strategies and local development frameworks) provide the framework for planning for sustainable development and for development to be managed effectively. This plan-led system, and the certainty and predictability it aims to provide, is central to planning and plays the key role in integrating sustainable development objectives. Where the development plan contains relevant policies, applications for planning permission should be determined in line with the plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.3 PPG17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation

5.4 PPS22 Renewable Energy (2004): Provides policy advice to promote and encourage the development of renewable energy sources. Local planning authorities should recognise the full range of renewable energy sources, their differing characteristics, location requirements and the potential for exploiting them subject to appropriate environmental safeguards.

5.5 PPS25 Development and Flood Risk (2006): States that flood risk should be taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and that development should be directed away from areas at highest risk. It states that development in areas of flood risk should only be permitted when there are no reasonably
available sites in areas of lower flood risk and benefits of the development outweigh the risks from flooding.

5.6 **Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions**: Advises that conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

5.7 **Circular 05/2005 - Planning Obligations**: Advises that planning obligations must be relevant to planning, necessary, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respect.

5.8 **East of England Plan 2008**

SS1 Achieving sustainable development  
ENV7 Quality in the built environment

5.9 **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003**

Planning Obligation Related Policies

P6/1 Development-related Provision

5.10 **Cambridge Local Plan 2006**

3/1 Sustainable development  
3/4 Responding to context  
3/7 Creating successful places  
3/11 The design of external spaces  
3/12 The design of new buildings  
4/2 Protection of Open Space  
4/4 Trees  
4/16 Development and flooding  
6/2 New Leisure Facilities  
8/2 Transport impact  
8/4 Walking and Cycling accessibility  
8/6 Cycle parking  
8/10 Off-street car parking  
8/16 Renewable energy in major new developments
Planning Obligation Related Policies

3/7 Creating successful places (public art/public realm)

5.11 Supplementary Planning Documents

**Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction:** Sets out essential and recommended design considerations of relevance to sustainable design and construction. Applicants for major developments are required to submit a sustainability checklist along with a corresponding sustainability statement that should set out information indicated in the checklist. Essential design considerations relate directly to specific policies in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Recommended considerations are ones that the council would like to see in major developments. Essential design considerations are urban design, transport, movement and accessibility, sustainable drainage (urban extensions), energy, recycling and waste facilities, biodiversity and pollution. Recommended design considerations are climate change adaptation, water, materials and construction waste and historic environment.

5.12 Material Considerations

**Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001)** - This document aims to aid strategic and development control planners when considering biodiversity in both policy development and dealing with planning proposals.

**Cambridge City Council (2004) – Planning Obligation Strategy:** Sets out the Council’s requirements in respect of issues such as public open space, transport, public art, community facility provision, affordable housing, public realm improvements and educational needs for new developments.

**Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy – Enhancing Biodiversity (2006): and Cambridge City Wildlife Sites Register (2005):** Give guidance on which habitats should be conserved and enhanced, how this should be carried out and how it relates to Biodiversity Action Plans.
Cambridge City Council (2002) - Provision of Public Art as Part of New Development Schemes: Encourages the provision of art as part of new development proposals, setting applicable thresholds.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

6.1 Response dated 15th April 2008: Objection on the grounds of highway safety. The proposed access to the temporary car park must be at least 4.8 metres in width to allow two cars to pass not the 3 metres proposed. The proposed width will inevitably lead to unnecessary and potentially hazardous manoeuvres within the highway.

6.2 The gates to the new car park/hard surface area must be set back at least 5 metres from the back of the highway to allow a car to fully clear the highway while waiting for the gates to be opened/closed.

6.3 Empirical evidence must be presented to prove that the average vehicle speed along Newton Road is 23mph given the transport assessment submitted with the application suggests visibility splays to the east of 2.4 metres by 3 metres in acceptable. The term ‘extensive’ is not considered acceptable and the splay to the west should therefore also be shown.

6.4 Should the application be approved further to the outstanding information above a condition requiring a traffic management plan for the demolition and construction phases of the proposed development should be imposed. Standard informatives are recommended.

6.5 Response dated 28th May 2008 following submission of further details from applicant: The information provided in response to the Highways Authority’s initial comments is considered acceptable. The proposed widening to the temporary car park will allow for two cars to pass while being wholly off the adopted public highway.

6.6 The Highways Authority have agreed that if the gates are to remain open during the hours at the beginning and end of the day to allow parents to access the area to drop off and pick up
pupils but remain closed at all other times this is considered acceptable for this will allow for cars to fully leave the public highway. It is requested a condition requiring the gates to be fully open at these times to ensure access onto the site without waiting on the highway is achieved in the interests of highway safety.

6.7 The Highway Authority’s response to the Development Control Forum shall be summarised on the amendment sheet.

Arboriculture

6.8 **Response dated 27th March 2008:** Pre-application discussions on site have consistently advised that the application cannot be supported for it will have an adverse impact upon 8 of the 10 limes trees fronting Newton Road given that the canopies will have to be lifted clear of the structure and the roots damaged by both the demolition and construction phases.

6.9 The footprint of the proposed building is larger than the existing, if the proposed building could be erected on the foundations of the existing without additional excavation the impact upon the roots would be acceptable. It is acknowledged the proposed building extends into a tarmaced area, however the construction of this is significantly shallow compared to the foundations required by the proposed building and it is likely shallow roots will have extended into this zone.

6.10 From experience the trunk protection proposed is unlikely to prove successful in fully protecting the tree trunks.

6.11 The canopies have already been crown lifted over the existing building to give adequate clearance. The higher proposed building will require further lifting of the canopies which will result in the loss of their aesthetical appearance and the amenity value the trees offer to the surrounded area for which is the very reason they have been protected. Further raising is also likely to have an adverse impact upon the aerodynamics of the crowns and cause further branches to fail.

6.12 **Response dated 1st May 2008 following a further meeting on site and submission of further information from applicant:** Object to the proposal. The pruning required to give adequate clearance to the proposed building will lift the
canopies of the row of lime trees even higher and add additional wounds which could make them vulnerable to infection, expose the canopies to aerodynamics causing the canopies to break apart, and aesthetically remove the amenity value the trees contribute. They are a significant feature of the road forming a strong boundary for the school. Their importance cannot be understated. If these trees die it would be difficult to replace them as new trees would need to establish in a confined rooting area and in a shaded position on the north side of a tall building.

6.13 The excavation of a foul waste system to Newton Road within the root protection area of the trees is unacceptable.

6.14 If minded to approve a meeting with the contractor must be held and various conditions designed to protect the trees as best as possible are suggested.

6.15 The use or car parking within the playing field is regretted for amenity reasons, the techniques proposed are designed to have a minimal impact upon the trees but is a slow erosion of green space.

**Head of Environmental Services**

6.15 No objection in principle but requests that standard conditions regarding hours of construction and noise insulation be imposed to mitigate any detrimental impact during the demotion and construction phases upon neighbouring residential amenity.

**Environment Agency**

6.16 No objections to the proposal but requests that a condition be imposed to ensure that the new building is protected from flood damage should an extreme event occur. Further to this all surface water from roofs should be piped direct to an approved surface water system using sealed down pipes as open gullies would not be acceptable, and only clean, uncontaminated surface water should be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer. The applicant should be made aware of this by means of an informative.
Policy and Projects

6.17 No objection in principle but there are concerns about the need to mitigate any significant long-term impact upon the remaining area of protected open space. Approval of this application should therefore condition the removal of temporary car parking and any temporary buildings from the site to allow the playing fields to be remediated and use to their maximum extent.

6.18 It is not considered appropriate for the relocation of approximately ten car parking spaces and the six metre wide track required to access these to encroach into the already reduced playing fields, contrary to Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of open space and in terms of policy 8/10 Off-street car parking whether this constitutes and over provision of parking contrary to the maximum car parking standards set out in Appendix C of the Cambridge Local Plan.

Sports England

6.19 Sports England would normally oppose development leading to the loss of, or prejudice the use of, all or part of a playing field, unless the proposed development is for an indoor or outdoor sports facility, the provision of which would be of sufficient benefit to the development of sport as to outweigh the detriment caused by the loss of the playing field.

6.20 The proposal would result in the reduction of space available for the Under 11s cricket pitch by 6 metres, resulting in the boundaries at each end being reduced by 3 metres. It is accepted that the resulting boundaries, at an average of 25-30 metres from the nearest wicket, are below ECB standards, though it is accepted this pitch will only be used for the youngest age group for this reason.

6.21 It is particularly dangerous that there is no safety boundary for the indicated cricket pitch and abuts the solid wall of the proposed hall. It is recommended the boundary be realigned to allow a minimum of 2 metres.
6.22 Part of the 200metre running track passes below the canopy of an existing beech tree this will need to be regularly pruned in the interests of health and safety.

6.23 Given that the proposal will offer a wider range of sports facilities it is considered that the benefits of the scheme outweigh the detriment caused by the loss of some of the playing field, however the concerns addressed above should be addressed. It is also suggested that should consent be granted a condition be imposed requiring full details of the management of the proposed hall for community use by non-school users.

Disability Access Officer

6.24 The plans do not show how the disabled changing rooms or viewing area will be set out. Conditions advising the applicant to review Part M of the Building Regulations, BS8300 and guidance produced by Sport England should be attached to any permission for the current proposal would not meet SENDA 2001.

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

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

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

22 Applecourt, Newton Road, Cambridge CB2 8AN
23 Applecourt, Newton Road, Cambridge CB2 8AN
15 Bentley Road, Cambridge CB2 8AW
19 Bentley Road, Cambridge CB2 8AW
29 Bentley Road, Cambridge CB2 8AW
1 Les Courtillets, The Avenue, Sark GY9 0SB
13 Newton Road, Cambridge CB2 8AL
15 Newton Road, Cambridge CB2 8AL
19 Newton Road, Cambridge CB2 8AG
24 Newton Road, Cambridge CB2 8AN
38 Newton Road, Cambridge CB2 8AL
39 Newton Road, Cambridge CB2 8AL
43 Newton Road, Cambridge CB2 8AL
2 Rayleigh Close, Cambridge CB2 8AZ
7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

**Context of site, design, and external spaces**

- The building is too close to the road;
- The building is too big for the context of the site and of a character and scale that is not in keeping with the surrounding area. It will therefore appear massive in comparison to neighbouring residential properties;
- The building fails to enhance the character of Newton Road and will result in a feel of a fortification around the edge of the site;

**Trees**

- The application fails to sympathetically acknowledge the lime trees along Newton Road;
- If the building was set back the line of lime trees could be used as a natural island with entry and exit for a drop off point for cars instead this development may result in them being destroyed;

**Neighbour amenity**

- Noise, disturbance, pollution and lack of privacy from car parking proposed along the southern boundary of the site;
- The relocated car parking spaces will appear unsightly and intrusive to neighbouring occupiers;
- The plans should include neighbouring properties so that the impact upon residential amenity may be fully assessed;
- The proposed option of the three considered affords the greatest impact upon neighbouring residents;
- Will result in noise and disturbance, not only during school hours but late in to the evening if used outside of school hours;
- Option 1 and 2 are considered acceptable but option 3 is not, this location will have a visual impact upon Rayleigh Close and result in increased noise and disturbance to the residential area.
Transport impact

- The proposal will exacerbate the already congested and dangerous situation in Newton Road and Trumpington Road arising from traffic generated by the school;
- The two proposed temporary access points and the existing access drive to Applecourt flat to the ‘fire access’ point of Nuffield Hospital is potentially dangerous;
- Lack of adequate provision for ‘drop off’ and ‘pick up’ within the school site. Provision should be made on site, the residential streets should not be exploited, this will be made worse by the proposal;
- The proposed exit into Newton Road is dangerous;
- Considered in relation to planning reference 08/0145/FUL at Nuffield Hospital this compounds an already dangerous traffic situation;
- Proposed parking bays behind nos. 13 to 15 Newton Road will create an unnecessary impact upon these homes;
- This scheme does nothing to alleviate congestion problems on the roads surrounding the school;
- The transport assessment is seriously flawed failing to address neighbouring occupiers concerns about overall traffic management on and around the site;

7.3 A representation was also received from the Bentley and Newton Roads Residents Association (BENERA) 40 Newton Road, Cambridge CB2 8AL. Their comments are summarised as follows;

- No amendments were made following a meeting held by the applicants on 25th February 2008 which is misleading in the Design and Assess Statement implying concerns of neighbours had been addressed;
- No attempt has been made to address traffic management on and around the site and this failure demonstrates the Traffic Assessment is seriously flawed;
- There is no evaluation of the impact upon other parts of the school and it organisation;
- Strong consideration should be given to siting the proposal further back from Newton Road to incorporate a drop off and pick up point. Sport England’s response is used in order to justify this not happening though there is enough room on site to reconfigure sporting provision to
answer Sport England’s concerns and facilitate the gymnasium further into the site;
- There is no acknowledgement in the Transport Assessment of other traffic flows on site nor the traffic problems on Trumpington Road;
- There is great concern with regard to the row of Lime trees, this could be mitigated by the setting back of the proposed gymnasium; and
- The school has not responded to parking and bollard problems on the north side of Newton Road, considered the safety implications of additional entrances on top of existing at the school and those used by Applecourt and Nuffield Hospital and the traffic management should be dealt with holistically.

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

8.0 ASSESSMENT

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

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Renewable energy and sustainability
4. Disabled access
5. Residential amenity
6. Trees
7. Highway safety
8. Car and cycle parking
9. Third party representations
10. Planning Obligation Strategy

Principle of Development

8.2 Supporting information submitted with the application outlines three possible sites considered for the proposed sports hall on the St. Faith’s School site. The first option, as proposed, sites the building on the land where the existing gymnasium currently stands. The development involves extension of this footprint
into both the protected open space and the flood plain but is considered by the applicant to present the best possible option in terms of management, accessibility and neighbouring residential amenity. Option 2 was positioned centrally to the grounds but discounted because this would require the removal of protected trees, a greater extent of the building would encroach upon the protected open space and the existing cricket pitch than the proposed option 1 and access is constrained, though here the development is located outside of the flood plain. Option 3 proposed the siting to the very south of the site adjacent to residential properties of Rayleigh Close presenting amenity issues, access would prove a major constraint and visually the proposal would relate poorly to existing buildings on site. The advantages to option 3 were that there would be no impact upon existing trees, it falls outside of the flood plain and the existing cricket pitch.

8.3 In principle the two main constraints identified relate to Cambridge Local Plan Policies 4/2 Protection of Open Space and Policy 6/2 New Leisure Facilities.

8.4 Policy 4/2 states; ‘development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons.

8.5 The supportive text goes on to read that; ‘only proposals which respect the character of these areas, and improve amenity, enhance biodiversity, improve sports facilities or increase public access will be supported’. Further to this Central Government advice PPG17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation considers the potential erosion of quality open spaces as a result of insensitive development or incremental loss of a site. In this instance it must be considered whether the benefits offered to the community outweigh the loss of the open space.

8.6 The proposal will result in an encroachment upon the protected open space. This in turn also reduces the space currently available for the Under 11s Cricket pitch by 6 metres, with the boundaries at each end losing 3 metres. However, reconfiguration of the existing cricket pitch, football pitch and 200 metre running track retain all activities currently undertaken on this space. Should the application be recommended for
approval a condition could be imposed in the interests of health and safety to ensure that a 2 metre boundary is made between the boundary of the relocated cricket pitch and the southern wall of the proposed sports hall, subject to this the proposal is considered acceptable by Sport England.

8.7 The proposed development will impinge upon the protected open space by 6 metres to the south onto the existing cricket pitch whilst I acknowledge that this area of protected open space is of value to the open and green feel of this area I consider this encroachment marginal when weighed against the benefits yielded as a result of the improved sports facility.

8.8 Sport England who would ordinarily oppose development leading to the loss of, or prejudice the use of, all or part of a playing field acknowledge that the overall benefits of the scheme outweigh the detriment caused by the loss of part of the playing field. However, were the application to be recommended for approval this would have been subject to the imposition of conditions which require the proposed facilities to be made available for use by the local community outside of school opening hours.

8.9 Paragraph 13 of PPG17 requires replacement space to be at least the equivalent of the space lost in terms of accessibility, size, usefulness, attractiveness and quality. The area which it is proposed to be lost is almost entirely grassed and I have no evidence that it is of environmental importance. Therefore in these circumstances I do not consider the proposal to be in conflict with policy 4/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) or with government guidance in PPG17.

8.10 Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policy 6/2 New Leisure Facilities states ‘Development for the provision or improvement of a leisure facility will be permitted if: a. it improves the range, quality and accessibility of facilities; b. it is of an appropriate scale for the locality; and c. it would not have a negative impact upon the vitality and viability of the City Centre, including the evening economy. Where sports facilities are provided through educational development community use may be sought through planning obligations.

8.11 In this instance criteria a. and b. of the above policy apply. As stated above I consider that the proposal would undoubtedly
represent an improvement of the sports facilities on site. The question of its appropriate scale for the locality will be considered in the section to follow.

8.12 In my opinion, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policies 4/2 and 6/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and advice contained within PPG7 subject to the proposal being assessed against Local Plan policies in the main body of the report below.

**Context of site, design and external spaces**

8.13 The proposed sports hall will occupy and extend the area where the current gymnasium stands, designed to accommodate four badminton courts, a basketball court or indoor cricket and changing for 120 boys to the ground floor and 80 girls on the first floor. The internal layout of the changing area is such that parts of the changing rooms may be segregated off when in use by other schools or the general public. Representations received cite the proposal as too large in scale and mass for its context and not in-keeping with the scale of the built form within the street scene of Newton Road. The proposal measures 32 metres in length and 17 metres in depth equating to a footprint of 576 metres$^2$. The maximum ridge height is 8.4 metres. Comparable to the existing gymnasium which is 23 metres in length and 12 metres in depth resulting in a floor area of 276 metres$^2$ with a ridge height of 7.8 metres the proposed sports hall will undoubtedly have a greater presence particularly in the street scene of Newton Road and will result in a fairly uninspired elevation that does little to enhance the street scene, largely due to the purpose of the building and omission of windows. However, I do not consider the increase in height and mass and the character, appearance and design of the building significantly different to that of the existing structure to an extent that it can be considered to have a considerable negative impact as to warrant refusal upon these grounds.

Renewable energy and sustainability

8.15 In accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16 the developer is required to provide at least 10 per cent of the development’s total predicted energy requirements on site, from renewable energy sources. A sustainability report has been submitted which outlines systems which have been investigated and which could be used to meet the objectives within ‘The Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document and increase the sustainability of the building.

8.16 It is proposed that generation of energy via renewable means on site will be achieved through solar and photovoltaic panels in order to meet the 10 per cent target CO2 reduction.

8.17 In my opinion the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and renewable energy and the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16 and ‘Cambridge Sustainable Development Guidelines’ (2003) should the application have been recommended for approval a condition to ensure full implementation of the renewable energy generation systems proposed would be suggested.

Disabled access

8.18 A well considered accessibility statement has been provided with the application which focuses upon issues of access for the disabled. This addresses the approach to the building and access into it, horizontal and vertical circulation, staircases, visual manifestations and the toilet and changing facilities. In my opinion I consider the proposal succeeds in addressing the needs of the disabled and therefore consider the proposal compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

8.19 The Disability Access Officer has reviewed the plans and suggested the applicant be advised to review Part M of the Building Regulations, BS8300 and guidance produced by Sport England because the current proposal would not meet SENDA 2001. Should the application have been recommended for approval I would suggest informatives to highlight these issues.
8.20 The main concerns raised by representations regarding neighbouring residential amenity relate to the potential increase of noise and disturbance from the improved facilities which will potentially be utilised outside of school hours and the proposed parking along the eastern boundary of the site which is to offset the loss off parking due to the proposed hall extending into the existing hard surfaced parking and play area.

8.21 The residential property closest to the proposed sports hall is 13 Newton Road to the east. This is approximately 28 metres from the hall and 10 metres from the boundary with the school grounds. Given that this use is already existing on site in this location I do not believe the comings and goings from the new facility will be markedly increased to the extent that undue noise and disturbance will be experienced by the occupiers of neighbouring properties. I acknowledge the proposed car parking along the eastern boundary does result in traffic movement closer to residential properties than currently exists. However, with a separation distance of approximately 4.5 metres from the car parking to the site boundary and a further 14 metres to 13 Newton Road and 22 metres to 15 Newton Road I consider this a reasonable distance as this area is only predominantly used at the beginning and end of the school day when traffic movement is at its greatest along the immediate surrounding roads anyway and the development will not add unreasonably to the existing situation.

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

Trees


*Development will not be permitted which would involve the felling, significant surgery\(^1\) or potential root damage to trees of amenity or other value unless these are demonstrable public benefits accruing from the proposal which outweigh the current and future amenity value of the trees. When felling is permitted,*
appropriate replacement planting will be sought wherever possible.

Either now or in the foreseeable future.

8.24 Justification text to policy 4/2 in paragraph 4.18 highlights the importance when assessing the development to be mindful of the implications not only to the current but also the future effect on the health of the trees. The Council’s Arboricultural Officer argues that the pruning to the row of mature Lime trees which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (Area 3 of the City of Cambridge (Trumpington Road) TPO No. 2/1976) along the northern boundary of the site fronting onto Newton Road required to implement the proposed building and provide adequate clearance will undoubtedly have a detrimental impact upon the protected trees. The canopies are already high over the existing gymnasium and to elevate the canopies even higher will result in additional wounds which could potentially result in infection, exposure of the canopies to aerodynamics that could cause them to break apart and would aesthetically remove the amenity value of the trees. These trees are considered to be a significant feature in the street scene of Newton Road and help form a strong boundary to the school grounds along this northern side. I concur with the Arboricultural Officer’s view that the importance and significance of these trees cannot be understated. These trees, while mature are considered to have a viable future life to justify their retention. Their importance and contribution to the green vegetated character of the Newton Road street scene is considered significant and replanting of trees to offset any loss is not considered acceptable given that the area afforded for the growth of new trees would be in a confined rooting area and in a shaded position on the northern side of the tall proposed building.

8.25 Paragraph 4.16 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 clearly states that ‘Trees on, or affected by, development sites are a material consideration in the determination of applications’. Given the reasons above I recommend refusal of the application for its failure to comply with policy 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) I consider the row of lime trees on Newton Road to be of significant amenity to the townscape and landscape and do not believe this proposal sympathetically acknowledges this importance nor can successfully demonstrate how it would overcome the very severe detrimental impact the development
would have upon these trees both during demolition/construction and the existence of the resultant built mass.

8.26 Further information has been submitted by the applicant and this has been passed to the Arboricultural Officer for their comments. The response to this information will be summarised on the amendment sheer. However, it is unlikely that any further information looking to disprove the opinion and advice of the Arboricultural Officer which has remained consistent from the pre-application stage will result in a change of recommendation.

Highway Safety

8.27 While demolition and construction is taking place a temporary access to the far north east of the site is proposed to access the car parking on the eastern boundary of the playing field proposed to offset the loss of parking spaces available to parents dropping off and picking up children at the beginning and end of the day as a result of the larger footprint of the proposed sports hall encroaching onto the existing hard-standing area to the east of the existing building and this area designated for construction plant while the works are taking place. This access has been cited in representations received from neighbouring residents as hazardous with movements from Applecourt and Nuffield Hospital opposite making for a dangerous junction.

8.28 Originally the proposed access measured 3 metres in width and was considered insufficient to allow two cars to pass one another. For this reason the Highway Authority requested the proposal be refused on the grounds of highway safety unless the access width can be increased to at least 4.8 metres in width to mitigate this problem. The applicant has submitted revised plans in response to this concern proposing an increase in the width of the temporary access to 5 metres. The Highway Authority have reviewed this amendment and now do not consider there to be a highway safety issue.

8.29 Initial consultation with the Highways Authority also raised concerns with regard to highway safety and the need to set back the gates to the new car park by at least 5 metres from the back of the adopted highway so that a car entering the area
may fully leave the highway whilst waiting for the gates to be
opened/closed. The applicants have responded to this concern
stating that the gates will remain closed when the hard standing
area is not being used for car parking at pick up and drop off
times. Should the application have been recommended for
approval the Highway Authority request the imposition of a
condition to control the hours that the gates shall remain closed
and locked.

8.30 Further conditions were also requested by the Highways
Authority to provide empirical evidence of vehicle speeds along
Newton Road justifying an approach speed of 23mph as cited in
the Transport Statement submitted with the application which in
turn determines the size of the visibility splays. Empirical
evidence has since been submitted and considered viable.
However, should the application have been recommended for
approval I would still consider it necessary to impose a
condition which ensures visibility splays are provided to the east
and west, not just the west as specified by the applicant.

8.31 Subject to the suggested conditions I consider the proposal has
satisfactorily answered initial concerns regarding highway
safety and is therefore compliant with Cambridge Local Plan

Car and Cycle Parking

8.32 The proposal is not intended to allow for an increase of staff or
pupil numbers but address a lack of facilities. As such there is
no need to increase the car or cycle parking provision on site.

8.33 The site access will remain as existing once the new facility is
open. However, consent is sought for a temporary access to the
northeast of the site during the demolition and construction
phases in order to segregate the construction activities whilst
retaining an area for the drop off and picking up of students at
the beginning and end of the school day, important to mitigate
the impact of traffic on Newton Road at these peak times. This
area extends along the eastern boundary of the playing field
with 24 car parking spaces either side of the access. Post
construction 14 spaces will be retained on the existing hard
standing area with 10 spaces along the eastern side of the
access into the playing field retained from the construction
phase permanently. This represents no net loss or gain of car
parking spaces as a result of the development though should the proposal be approved a condition to remediate the land temporarily used for parking on the western side of the access road to its original state would have been recommended.

8.34 Despite no requirement to increase cycle parking provision 10 cycle parking spaces are proposed adjacent to the main pedestrian entrance from Newton Road in recognition that the sports hall maybe used outside of core school hours.

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

Issues raised at the Development Control Forum Meeting

8.36 Objectors believe the application should be considered in conjunction with planning reference 08/0285/FUL. For clarification purposes this application sought consent for a gravel access road with provision for 22 parking spaces at the Football Field Rear Of 17 Trumpington Road. This application has been refused under delegated powers and therefore has no material bearing upon the consideration of this proposal.

8.37 While concern was raised about the importance of the trees and there was a general agreement between objectors that the proposed gymnasium was too big a mass in the street scene of Newton Road and a better design solution was needed, the primary focus of objectors at the forum was with regard to traffic and parking problems.

8.38 The following concerns were raised:

   It was felt a transport assessment should deal with the issues across the whole of the site;
   The temporary access proposed during the construction phase raises safety issues;
   Illegal parking on the northern side of Newton Road is currently discouraged only by unregulated bollards which is ineffective and unsightly;
   Cars park alongside the boundaries of residential properties which is unacceptable;
   Double yellow line enforcement is weak in the area;
   Previous developments have continued with no traffic management policy; and
Given the size of the site there is room to fulfil the requirements of Sports England and have off road parking/a drop-off area.

8.39 In answer to the concerns raised above those considered material planning issues have been addressed under the heading highway safety. I am satisfied that the Transport Statement submitted with the application was comprehensive in addressing all that it needed to for the purpose of this proposal. Consultation with the Highways Authority resulted in a request that empirical data be supplied to support the statement and that the temporary access be widened in the interests of highway safety, this is acknowledged in the section of the main reported sub-headed 'Highway Safety' no other issues with regard to highway safety were raised by the Highways Authority.

Third Party Representations

8.40 I acknowledge the weight of the local opinion against this proposal which constitutes material consideration. I believe I have addressed the issues raised in my assessment.

8.41 The majority of opposition was with regard to traffic management and the feeling of local residents that the school fails to do this successfully. This the main points of contention raised at the Development Control Forum held on the 30th April 2008, are summarised in the section above. However, this planning application must be considered on its own merits and assessed in terms of what is proposed only. The need for greater discussion between the school and neighbours was acknowledged by both parties at the Development Control Forum. It is expected that this will assist the current situation, however, such actions cannot be appropriately secured through this determination.

Planning Obligation Strategy

8.42 The Planning Obligation Strategy (2004) provides a framework for expenditure of financial contributions collected through planning obligations. (The applicants have indicated their willingness to enter into a S106 planning obligation in accordance with the requirements of the strategy). The proposed development requires a contribution to be made
towards the provision of public art. A contribution is sought for a value equal to 1 per cent of the construction costs of the project, either to be provided as a commuted sum, or preferably as on-site provision to an equivalent value.

8.43 A S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2004) is yet to be completed. Subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation to secure the requirements of the Planning Obligation Strategy (2004), I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003) policies P6/1 and 9/8 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 10/1.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason/s:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of the scale and position of the proposed sports hall, would be likely to generate the need for significant tree surgery at the time of construction and in the future and potential damage to tree roots in the course of construction. In so doing the development would be likely to have an adverse impact upon trees that are subject to tree preservation orders and of amenity value. The development is therefore contrary to policy 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

2. The proposed development does not make appropriate provision for public art, in accordance with policy 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006; and policy P6/1 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003; and as detailed in the Planning Obligation Strategy 2004 or Provision of Public Art as Part of New Development Schemes 2002.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Under Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972, the following are “background papers” for each report on a planning application:

1. The planning application and plans;
2. Any explanatory or accompanying letter or document from the applicant;
3. Comments of Council departments on the application;
4. Comments or representations by third parties on the application as referred to in the report plus any additional comments received before the meeting at which the application is considered; unless (in each case) the document discloses “exempt or confidential information”

5. Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Council Policy Document referred to in individual reports.

These papers may be inspected by contacting John Summers (Ext.7103) in the Planning Department.
CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

Notes of a Development Control Forum

• St Faiths School, Trumpington Road, Cambridge
• Football Field, rear of 17 Trumpington Road, Cambridge

30 April 2008 10.00am – 12.00pm

Application No: 08/0337/FUL
Site Address: St Faiths School, Trumpington Road, Cambridge
Description: Erection of multi-purpose sports hall to accommodate 4 badminton courts and associated changing rooms, together with a reconfigured car park/outdoor play facility and associated works (following demolition of existing building).
Applicant: St Faiths School
Agent: Justin Bainton of January’s 7 Dukes Court, 54-62 Newmarket Road, Cambridge
Lead Petitioner: Dr John T Green
Address: 40 Newton Road, Cambridge
Case Officer: Amy Lack

Application No: 08/0285/FUL
Site Address: Football Field, r/o 17 Trumpington Road, Cambridge
Description: Gravel access road with provision for 22 parking spaces
Applicant: St Faiths School
Agent: SMC Covell Matthews (Justin Bainton of January’s will cover this application.
Lead Petitioner: Dr John T Green
Address: 40 Newton Road, Cambridge
Case Officer: Tony Collins

Present:

For Applicant
Colin Brown – Januarys
Carol Smith – St Faiths Bursar
Justin Bainton – Januarys

For Petitioners
Dr John Green – Chair of Bentley & Newton Roads Residents Association (BENERA)
Andy Gordon – local resident
Alan Browne – Director of Arup
Members of Planning Committee
City Councillors Baker, Blair, Blencowe, Dixon and Zmura

Members of the South Area Committee
City Councillor Blackhurst and County Councillor Kent

Declarations of Interest by Members
Cllr Kent: As Member of Latham Road Residents Association and therefore a consultee

It was agreed that Cllr Kent would not ask questions relating to this application (08/0285/FUL)

Officers
Sarah Dyer (Chair), Tony Collins (Case Officer) Glenn Burgess and Toni Birkin (Committee Managers) and Dr Jon Finney (Development Control Engineer (City and South)

Text of Petition
The text of the petitions was as follows:

I have been asked by my membership to write in my capacity as Chair of Bentley & Newton Roads Residents Association (BENERA), which has around 100 member households, comprising over 80% of households eligible to be members in this area (which covers Newton Road, Bentley Road and their side roads). We object to the above application.

Case by Applicants

Application 08/0337/FUL
Mr Brown made the following points:
1) Highlighted that these are two entirely separate applications
2) Each application needs to be addressed on its own merits
3) The sites are not connected in any way
4) Any decision on one application will have no impact on the other

Justin Bainton made the following points:
5) The proposed sports hall is a strong and attractive design
6) There will be no increase in staff or student numbers as a result
7) For 1 academic year there will be a need for temporary classrooms – and these will be subject to a separate planning application
Carol Smith made the following points:
8) The current sports hall has 1 gym and is too small for use by year 7 and 8 pupils
9) These pupils are required to use facilities at the Leys Schools - resulting in 34 additional minibus journeys and approximately 120 additional walking hours per year
10) The available time slots at the Leys School are also reducing
11) A new sports hall will mean:
   - less wasted time for pupils and staff
   - easier to manage timetables
   - increased use in bad weather
   - comparable facilities to other local schools

Mr Brown made the following points:
12) We have looked at alternative sites but are limited due by policy considerations
13) Parts of the site are protected by open space policy in the local plan
14) In order to use the proposed new facilities for inter school events, and for the wider local community, it is essential to have main highway access
15) We have looked at the possibility of an ‘in-out drop off’ facility but it would reduce the functionality of the running track and the cricket pitch
16) Sports England have objected to changes in the running track and cricket pitch and it would also mean pupils still traveling off site to use other facilities
17) We have looked at all the alternatives and this is the only viable option
18) The car parking provision will be used for both parking and informal play
19) We consider the proximity of parking to the borders of residential properties to be acceptable but have offered to reduce this
20) The proposal will require new foundations but this will not affect the existing trees
21) The height will increase from 7.8m to 8.4m – but this will not affect the existing trees
22) This a replacement facility – there will be no additional staff or pupils
23) No additional traffic will be generated as a result of the proposal
24) Journeys to the Leys school will be dramatically reduced

Carol Smith made the following points:
25) St Faiths (and other local schools) meet jointly with Cambridgeshire County Council to discuss the traffic implications of schools
26) Based on 2006 information:
   - 60% of school journeys are part of another journey (i.e work/shopping)
   - 58% of pupils live more than 2 miles away from the school
   - 22% of pupils walk, bike or catch a bus
- 24% of pupils car share (with regular lists produced for parents)
- 50 pupils travel on park and ride (with other buses from further a field)
- The school has cycle parking for 100
- Times of drop off and collection are staggered to reduce traffic and parking issues

Mr Brown made the following points:
27) A circuit through the school car park (as in the Perse School example) to alleviate traffic problems would not be suitable for our site. We also feel it would be unsafe for pupils

Application 08/0285FUL
Mr Bainton made the following points:
28) Work originally started last year as we were not aware that consent was needed
29) As soon as we became aware – all work stopped
30) Retrospective planning consent has now been applied for
31) The application is for a low-key upgrade to the area – allowing for 22 car spaces
32) This will allow for improved drainage and increased use of the site in the winter
33) The site will be mostly used on Wednesdays and Saturdays during term time and gated to stop unauthorised use
34) We have increased the proposed landscaping on the site to break up the gravel areas
35) The vistas across the playing fields have been retained

Case By Petitioners
Dr Green presented the views of the petitioners against the application:
36) BENERA represents around 100 households in the affected area
37) Never before have members been so united in support of an objection petition
38) We have good relations with St Faiths and support development of the school and its activities - provided they are developed in a reasonable way that takes into account the impact of its business on its environment
39) This good neighbourliness is lacking when it comes to issues around parking and traffic
40) We recognise that the applications are separate but feel they cannot be considered independently because:
   - the activities (namely sport) are interdependent and within 50 metres of one another
- both include new parking arrangements which have implications between sites
- both include access to improved sports facilities - leading to increased usage and therefore increased traffic and parking

Application 08/0285/FUL
Dr Green presented the views of the petitioners against the application:
41) A full and comprehensive traffic assessment is needed
42) There are safety issues at Latham/Trumpington Road junction
43) The approach to parking on this site is piecemeal
44) Parking demand is greater than the capacity provided
45) The proposal for parking near the boundaries of residential properties is unacceptable in environment and amenity terms. If one application is turned down on this – both should be
46) Residents asked for consideration to be given to alternative transport linkages when the previous Astroturf application came forward – nothing came of this
47) Other possible solutions need to be looked at and a thorough professional assessment of transport and parking undertaken
48) There needs to be a holistic traffic management plan and parking management plan for both sites

Application 08/0337/FUL
Dr Green presented the views of the petitioners against the application:
49) We agree with the concerns of the Aboricultural Officer - particularly around potential damage to trees on the site during construction
50) A possible solution is to set back the proposed sports hall to protect the trees. This would also enable an in-out drop off facility which would elevate traffic and parking problems
51) The site and mass is appropriate to the streetscape – a better design is needed
52) The traffic assessment needs to deal with the whole site and offer solutions – not just raise issues and concerns
53) The proposed 4th entrance at the bend of Newton Road raises safety issues. There have already been 3 major accidents in the last 12 months
54) Illegal parking to the north side of Newton Road is currently discouraged by unregulated bollards – which is a fudged situation
55) Parking alongside the boundaries of residential properties is unacceptable in environmental and amenity terms
56) Double yellow line enforcement in this area is weak
57) Recent developments have been progressed with no traffic management policy – now the time has come to say ‘no’ to incremental developments unless the consequences of them are addressed too
58) The site is large – there is unquestionably room to fulfil the requirements of Sports England and have off road parking and a drop-off

Mr Gordon presented views of the petitioners against the application
59) Rides bike on Newton Road every day and sees the issues
60) There are lots of cars in bus lanes and on yellow lines
61) The coning is Newton Road is effective but is ugly and unnecessary
62) Deliveries at the Nuffield Hospital involve large trucks during peak time – sometimes on yellow lines. This does not help visibility
63) This is a good opportunity to insist on a traffic management plan
64) Usage of the site will increase – and the conduct of drivers will not change

Dr Green presented the views of the petitioners against the application:
65) The issues raised by Sports England are being used inappropriately by the applicants to support their case
66) The possibility of an in-out system has been rejected as they have made an assumption that it would result in queuing in the bus lane. The Perse School example shows this is not always the case and should not be dismissed without thorough and professional examination

Mr Browne presented the views of the petitioners against the application:
67) Is Director of Arup (Consulting Engineers to the Planning and Building Industry)
68) We work mostly with schools and universities and project managed the Perse School developments - advising them on 2 applications.
69) We recommended that the Perse School applications be linked in transport assessment terms and looked at junctions, trip generation, traffic surveys and parent/pupil consultation
70) It is recommended that the long-term consequences of any work is looked at carefully
71) A full transport and parking plan should always be done – looking at issues around pupils, teachers and deliveries
72) Safety, DDA and neighbourhood issues should be addressed and incorporated into any Green Transport Plan
73) A holistic approach should be taken looking at current and future transport flows
74) It is essential to generate the confidence of key stakeholders such as residents
The Case Officer’s comments:

Application 08/0285/FUL
75) This application was received on 27th February 2008. Further information was required; this was received on 10th March, when the application was accepted as valid.
76) The application follows concerns raised locally about engineering operations which were taking place on site and advice to the applicants from the Planning Investigation Service that planning permission was required for the development. Considerable work had been carried out on site before the application was made, including the laying down of chipped stone across almost the whole of the application site.
77) Notification of the application was sent to neighbours at all addresses on the west side of Trumpington Road from 1 to 23, all addresses in Latham Road except for River Farm Cottages, and all the flats in Southacre Drive. A site notice was also posted and an advertisement placed in the Cambridge Evening News on 4th April.
78) Received written representations from 2 residents in Latham Road, from the Southacre, Latham Road and Chaucer Road Residents’ Association and from County Councillor Anne Kent.

The main grounds given for objecting are as follows.

Residential amenity. These objections refer to additional noise and pollution, especially for No 7 Latham Road.

Highway issues. Objections under this heading refer to the narrowness of the road, the conflict with extensive pedestrian traffic, restricted visibility at junctions, and the possibility that the field could be more safely accessed by cars at other points.

Impact on the conservation area. Under this heading it is suggested that the proposed openness of the proposed layout, the hard surface and formal layout, the presence of more cars and the loss of part of the hedge at the entrance would detract from the quietness, greenness, rural character and attractive views which characterise the conservation area.

Sustainability. These objections suggest that the development conflicts with the need to discourage access to the field by car and encourage sustainable alternatives.
79) Also undertaken a number of policy consultations, as follows.

1. **The Highway Authority** states that visibility splays of 2.4m x 70m must be demonstrated, and full details of access road width and parking and manoeuvringle space provided. The authority also recommends conditions governing 2m x 2m pedestrian visibility splays and the hard paving of the first 5m of the access road to prevent the spread of debris.

2. **Sports England** has no objection.

3. **The Planning Policy team** raise concerns that the development would be contrary to policy on the protection of open space, and would conflict with government guidance on Green Belts contained in PPG2. The team also suggest that the proposal might result in overprovision of car parking, contrary to the City Council’s maximum standards.

4. **The Arboriculture Department** raises concerns about the impact of the development on adjacent trees and hedges, and urges that remedial work be undertaken and any proposal for car parking on the site be redesigned to avoid damage to trees and hedges. Subsequent investigations on site have offered reassurance on aspects of this issue, but the Principal Arboricultural Officer is of the view that to be acceptable, car parking provision on this site would need to be configured differently from that proposed.

80) Amended plans have been received from the applicant, but the timescale for the determination of the application does not allow sufficient time for me to renotify neighbours or consultees, and at present I expect to make a recommendation on the basis of the details originally submitted.

**Application 08/0337/FUL**

81) This application was received on 10th March 2008.

82) Notification of the application was sent to 27 neighbouring addresses in Newton Road, Trumpington Road, and Latham Road on 20th March 2008. The application was also publicised by a site notice, and by an advertisement in the Cambridge Evening News on 28th March 2008.

83) The case officer has received written representations from 19 individual occupiers or owners: 10 from Newton Road, 3 from Bentley Road, 5 from Rayleigh Close, and one by email without address. She has also received representations from the Bentley Road and Newton Road Residents Association.
The main grounds given for objecting are as follows.

**Principle of development.** These objections oppose the intensification of use on the site or question the need for the facility at all.

**Residential amenity.** These objections refer to the impact of additional car parking spaces for the inhabitants of 13 and 15 Newton Road.

**Highway issues.** These are by some margin the most frequent objections. They centre on two main issues: the hazards which might be created by additional traffic, and particularly by the positioning of the proposed access points, and the anticipated worsening of the problems created around the school by vehicles dropping off and picking up pupils at the beginning and end of the school day. Objections suggest that this problem requires a thorough review.

**Design.** Under this heading it is suggested that the building is too massive, that it would be like a fortress, and that it should be sited further away from the street.

**Trees.** These objections suggest that the development would threaten the health and welfare of trees which are of amenity value.

In addition, five representations state that one of the alternative sites for the sports hall, analysed in supporting documents, but not proposed in the application, would be unacceptable.

84) The case officer has also undertaken a number of policy consultations, as follows.

1. **The Highway Authority** states that the proposed access to the temporary car park is insufficiently wide, and recommends refusal of the application on these grounds. The authority also requires that the entrance gates to the new car park must be set back 5m from the back of the highway, and that the first 5m of the access track must be hard paved to prevent the spread of debris on to the highway. The authority also requires empirical evidence of representative vehicle speeds in Newton Road before being satisfied that the visibility splays proposed are adequate. A condition requiring a traffic management plan for the demolition and construction periods is also sought.
2. **Sports England** is satisfied that the benefits of the scheme outweigh the detriment caused by the loss of part of the playing field. Sport England raises some issues about the detailed layout, and recommends a condition requiring the submission and approval of a Community Use Scheme.

3. **The Planning Policy team** has no objection to the development of a sports hall. The team recommend a condition to ensure the removal of temporary car parking and temporary buildings from the site after the development. The team raise concerns that the development would be contrary to policy on the protection of open space, and also suggest that the proposal might result in overprovision of car parking, contrary to the City Council’s maximum standards.

4. **The Arboriculture Department** state that they cannot support the proposal because it will lead to an adverse effect on 8 of the 10 lime trees fronting Newton Road, through root damage and because of the amount of additional pruning required. The clearance from the tree trunks is also felt to be insufficient to allow construction without further damage.

5. **The Environmental Health Department** recommend conditions to control construction hours and dust suppression during construction, and noise insulation when the building is operational.

6. **The Environment Agency** recommends a condition requiring a minimum ground floor level to provide a reasonable freeboard against extreme flooding.

---

**Members questions and comments**

85) It is stated that, as this is a replacement facility, there will no increase in pupils or staff – but with more community and inter school use overall numbers will increase. Will the final officers report address this?

  *Colin Brown: Inter school matches are currently held on the site – so this will not change. At the moment there is no community use of the site but this is something we are exploring. It is unlikely that this additional activity would have an impact during the ‘stress times’ of the day (i.e school drop off and collection)*

86) Although they are separate applications will the officer look at the cumulative impact of the traffic issues?
Tony Collins: The report will address will address this – but the applications deal with two separate aspects of car parking with differing objections

87) Has the Schools Transport Plan been shared with local residents and have they had an input into the document?

Carol Smith: A full transport plan is in place and regularly monitored but has unfortunately not been shared with residents. We do work with parents to encourage them to be considerate to our neighbours and use the car sharing schemes – however we cannot control their actions

88) Is the parking outside No: 13 and No: 15 Newton Road permanent or temporary?

Colin Brown: During construction there is a need for this as temporary parking and the applications set down the details of this and the permanent spaces. These are similar but with a different configuration

89) What is the impact for the trees on Newton Road?

A: We feel we have addressed any issues around the impact on the tree roots by using special piling methods for the foundations. With regard to visual amenity – there will be limited additional crown raising needed

90) Sitting of the proposed sports hall: is it exactly the same footprint but higher?

Colin Brown: The footprint is not identical:
- Existing building: 23m long and 12m deep (height: 7.8m)
- Proposed building: 32m long and 17m deep (height 8.4m)

91) I would hope that there were further negotiation to be had between the neighbours and the applicants and that the County Councils advice address all the issues raised

A: Noted

92) Highlighted that the issue of illegal parking would not form part of planning consideration.
Any issues should reported to 01223 458520

A: Noted
93) Highlighted that the two applications would be determined by different committees

   Sarah Dyer: The Planning Department has delegated power to approve/refuse 08/0285/FUL so it may not have to go to the Area Committee

94) How will the number of car parking spaces change?

   Tony Collins: The number of available spaces is the same – but configured differently

95) Were the Aboricultural Officers views given after all the representations were received?

   A: The Councils Aboricultural Officer has not seen some aspects of the applicant’s tree advice information

96) Have the County Council seen all of the information?

   Dr Jon Finney: We have not seen the Transport Assessment in detail but intend to

97) Asked for clarification regarding the open space policy

   Tony Collins: The site is within a conservation area but outside the green belt. However planning policy PPG2 states that if it has an impact on the green belt (even though it is outside of it) – it can be considered

98) When the County Council looks at the Transport Assessment they need to be mindful that parking in Trumpington Road bus lane is to be reviewed. It was only a temporary measure

   A: Noted

Summing Up by the Applicant

99) We fully understand and accept the concerns regarding traffic but every effort is being made by the school to address this

100) It is inevitable that the school has an impact on the local area but we work hard with the residents and aim to continue this dialogue

101) This is a replacement sports hall – with no increase in pupils or staff – and all planning issues have been covered
102) There is no intention to use the car parking (08/0285/FUL) outside of the times of matches – mostly on Wednesdays and Saturdays
103) An in-out drop off facility would not be viable and would be a safety issue for pupils
104) The Purse School example is very different due to the configuration of the site. They were proposing an increase of 250 students so were required to take extra measures
105) Sports England are supportive of our proposals
106) We are taking a holistic view of the site
107) Revised proposals have been presented to the council to protect the trees
108) We are happy to work with local residents to address any issues

**Summing Up by the Petitioners – against the application**
109) Residents have good relations with the school apart from on traffic and parking matters
110) We are happy to be consulted but were only given 3 days on this occasion
111) The school has an obligation to control parents actions – it is their responsibility
112) The school cannot guarantee that parking will only happen on Wednesday and Saturday
113) Although they are separate applications – we hope that planning is not so inflexible that it cannot look at things holistically
114) We are not oppose to the expansion and progress of the school – and in fact welcome it – but it has to be done in a strategic way