

Application Number	17/0473/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	14th March 2017	Officer	Tony Collins
Target Date	13th June 2017		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	University Sports And Athletics Track Wilberforce Road Cambridge CB3 0EQ		
Proposal	The construction of two artificial grass pitches (AGPs), installation of floodlighting to both pitches, replacement fencing to existing pitch, extension of balcony on western elevation of the pavilion, insertion of two sets of doors on north elevation of pavilion, replacement of pitched roof with flat roof on scorer's hut, construction of an electrical substation, car and cycle parking and associated landscaping and drainage works.		
Applicant	Chancellor, Masters and Scholars The University of Cambri... C/O Agent		

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">It is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">It is in accordance with local and national planning policy on improving access to high-quality opportunities for sport and recreation</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">It addresses a priority need identified in the Council's Playing Pitches Strategy</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">It would not have harmful impacts on neighbour amenity through noise or obtrusive light impact</p>
----------------	---

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The University Athletic Ground is on the west side of the city, accessed from a point at the junction of Adams Road and Wilberforce Road. It is bounded to the east and north-west by residential areas, to the north by Cambridge Lawn Tennis Club and Emmanuel College sports ground, and to the west and south by open agricultural land.
- 1.2 The ground lies wholly within the Green Belt. It is defined in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 as protected open space. The site is not in a conservation area, but the western boundary of City of Cambridge Conservation Area No.2 (West) runs along the north and east edges of the Athletic Ground. None of the trees on the site is protected.
- 1.3 The Coton footpath, an important pedestrian and cycle route from the city centre to the West Cambridge campus of the University, the village of Coton, and areas further west, runs along the northern boundary of the site. This part of the Footpath is a County Wildlife site. The route of the footpath and the triangle of land between the Athletic Ground and Emmanuel College sports ground form part of the Preferred Option catchment area within which the City Deal Board has resolved that a specific route for the proposed Cambridge – Cambourne improved bus service should be sought.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks to create two new full-size (100m x 63m) artificial grass hockey pitches (AGPs) with adjoining technical areas and goal storage areas on a part of the University Athletic Ground which is at present an unmarked open grass area with some shrubs and trees, which has been used for hammer-throwing practice.
- 2.2 The application also seeks to erect 5m high ball-stop fencing and kickboards around the two new pitches and to replace the existing fencing of the existing AGP on the site with the same 5m high fencing. Permission is also sought for new hard standing areas

adjacent to these pitches for access and spectators, and a 1.2m high barrier to separate the hard standing from the pitches.

- 2.3 The application also seeks permission for floodlights for the two new AGPs, and for the permitted hours for floodlight use to be extended.
- 2.4 In addition, the application also seeks permission for the insertion of two sets of ground-floor doors in the north elevation of the existing pavilion, and a new balcony at first floor on the west side of the pavilion, the conversion of the pitched roof of the existing scorers' hut to a flat roof, the construction of a new electricity sub-station, the provision of additional car and cycle parking, and associated landscaping and drainage works

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
88/1362	Erection of university sports pavilion and construction of athletics track.	Refused
88/1495	Erection of university sports complex (outline application) including sports hall, pool hall, athletics track, and artificial playing surfaces.	Refused
90/0673	University sports complex including athletics track, sports hall, practice pitches and car parking.	Not determined; appeal dismissed
90/1144	University sports facilities.	Refused
92/0305	University sport facilities (including two storey pavilion building, athletics track, two all-weather pitches, associated parking and landscaping).	Approved subject to conditions
94/0347	Erection of fourteen floodlighting columns (16m high).	Withdrawn
95/0500	Erection of access road, car park, pedestrian and security	Approved with conditions

	lighting (retrospective).	
97/1237	Erection of eight 16m columns with floodlighting.	Refused
99/0253	Erection of eight demountable floodlighting columns with luminaires (lights and columns to be taken down each year between 5 May and 5 October).	Approved with conditions
07/0939	Erection of floodlights to serve athletics track and existing and proposed hockey pitches.	Approved with conditions
12/0874	Freestanding sign	Approved with conditions

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

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

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN		POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2006	Local	3/1 3/2 3/3 3/4 3/7 3/11 3/14 4/1 4/2 4/3 4/4 4/6 4/7 4/11 4/13 4/15 4/16 6/2 8/2 8/4 8/6 8/8 8/10

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

<p>Central Government Guidance</p>	<p>National Planning Policy Framework March 2012</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement – Green Belt protection and intentional unauthorised development August 2015</p>
<p>Supplementary Planning Guidance</p>	<p>Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)</p>
<p>Material Considerations</p>	<p><u>City Wide Guidance</u></p> <p>Arboricultural Strategy (2004)</p> <p>Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001).</p> <p>Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006)</p> <p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2010)</p> <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2005)</p> <p>Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011)</p> <p>Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy</p> <p>A Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (2006)</p>

	<p>Greater Cambridge Area Encompassing Cambridge City Council & South Cambridgeshire District Council Playing Pitch Strategy 2015-2031 June 2016</p> <p>Cambridge Walking and Cycling Strategy (2002)</p>
	<p><u>Area Guidelines</u></p> <p>West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)</p>

5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

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

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

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

- 6.1 No significant impact on the public highway, subject to a condition to control visibility of the light source from highway locations.

Environmental Health

Construction noise

- 6.2 Recommend standard conditions for: construction collection / delivery hours, details of contractors operations and dust.

Operational noise – electricity substation

- 6.3 The approach is generally acceptable, but the proposed location at which environmental noise limiting criteria should be met (i.e. the bedroom windows of nearby noise sensitive premises) is not acceptable. It is required that, in accordance with BS4142:2014, the noise rating level from proposed new plant and equipment should be less than or equal to the existing background level (L₉₀) **at the boundary of the application premises**. The standard plant noise insulation condition is recommended to address this issue.

Operational noise – hockey pitches

- 6.4 It is important to note that no specific noise assessment methodology / guidance or absolute noise acceptability criteria exists for hockey pitch use. The effects of noise are primarily subjective. The acceptability of proposals requires professional judgement to be applied to a balance of various noise factors and how they combine in any particular situation.
- 6.5 The submitted noise assessment is generally acceptable and has had due regard to national and industry noise standards, best practice and technical guidance. Typical noise levels for AGP use have been ascertained from actual noise measurements of various sporting sessions on four separate AGPs elsewhere, and the *'overall noise level from AGP use'* used in the assessment to predict noise impacts at residential premises is considered representative and acceptable. I agree with the comparative noise assessment that has been undertaken for the *'overall noise level from AGP use'*.
- 6.6 World Health Organisation (WHO) guideline values for community noise, and BS8233:2014 both suggest that to protect the majority of people from being moderately annoyed during the daytime, the sound pressure level on balconies, terraces and outdoor living areas should not exceed 50dB LAeq for a steady, continuous noise. The submitted report concludes that the *'overall noise level from AGP use'* will be below these levels and is therefore acceptable. However both the WHO Guidelines and BS 8233 are really only appropriate for *"anonymous - impersonal noise"* such as

such as road traffic or similar. Noise which is attributable to a particular source or which has a tonal or intermittent characteristic may cause annoyance at lower levels than these and in such cases an assessment linked to background noise levels may be more appropriate.

- 6.7 The Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (IEMA) guidelines set out key principles for noise impact assessment relevant to all types of project regardless of size. These guidelines accept that a simple change in noise levels using a single noise indicator may fail to adequately reveal the actual noise impact of the proposal. The character and nature of the noise must be taken into account and the guidelines suggest comparing several noise indicators such as the LAeq, LMax and LA90 as a more rigorous approach.
- 6.8 Previous experience suggests that the most important factor in determining the degree of annoyance and disturbance created by hockey pitches and similar facilities is the difference between the future and existing situations in terms of the type and nature of the noise source: in particular, the number of individual maximum impulsive noise levels (such as ball-on-backboard, stick-on-ball, whistles and shouts), degree of intermittency and frequency and pattern of occurrence. Those hearing these noises are likely to be more sensitive to them during the evening and at weekends.
- 6.9 The noise assessment has assessed the intermittent individual impact noises (dB LMax fast) from hockey balls hitting the perimeter fencing and goal baseboards. The application proposes to mitigate these noises by fitting dampening material to all side strike and goal boards. This is acceptable and will adequately deal with this source of noise. The application also proposes neoprene isolators between the perimeter enclosure fence panels and fence posts to minimise noise from ball impacts upon the fence. This is also welcomed.
- 6.10 I have no concerns about the use of pitches 1 and 2 as the recommended mitigation measures proposed, combined with distance separation to existing noise sensitive premises in Perry Court, Wilberforce Road and Adams Road should result in a very limited and negligible noise impact at any time.

- 6.11 However, pitch 3 will be closer to residential neighbours at Perry Court and I am more concerned about potential adverse impact on quality of life / amenity from this pitch. Backboard noise has been addressed by the dampening proposed, but residents here will be able to hear whistle noise, stick-on-ball and shouting when Pitch 3 is in use. Although these will not be at a high intrusive level, the assessment does acknowledge that these noises '*may be noticeable but not intrusive*'. Remaining noise impacts should be mitigated and reduced to a minimum, in particular in the evening and at weekends when residents of Perry Court are more likely to be using their gardens. For this reason, use of Pitch 3 should not be permitted after 1900 on Saturdays or Sundays, nor after 1830 on Bank Holidays.
- 6.12 Although restricted hours of operation are proposed for the artificial floodlighting, no specific hours of use for the pitch are proposed; it is recommended that conditions should be imposed restricting the hours of use of the hockey pitches so that they are generally consistent with times permitted for artificial lighting use.
- 6.13 Conditions are also recommended to prohibit the use of a PA, to prohibit concurrent use of pitch 3 and a competitive athletics meet on the track, to require an Operational Noise Management and Monitoring Plan and to require compliance with the noise insulation scheme.

Obtrusive artificial lighting impact

- 6.14 The proposed lighting scheme will fully comply with the Obtrusive Light Limitation recommendations of the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) for a zone classified E2 (rural surroundings with a low district brightness e.g. a village or relatively dark outer suburban location). It is also important to note that the lighting calculations that have been modelled to existing residential premises do not account for any physical obstructions such as planting, trees or fences. These will provide further screening and in reality lighting levels off-site are therefore expected to be lower than calculated.
- 6.15 An acceptable cumulative artificial lighting impact assessment (for all 3 hockey pitches) has been submitted. Providing artificial light is installed and maintained fully in accordance with the submitted lighting report I do not envisage any unacceptable adverse impact

on residential amenity. Therefore no objection in relation to impacts on residential amenity and quality of life from additional lights or altered hours of use.

- 6.16 Conditions recommended to secure artificial lighting compliance and restricted hours of use.

Air quality

- 6.17 The potential for any adverse impact on local air quality is nil or at worst negligible.

Urban Design and Conservation Team

- 6.18 Replacement of real grass by bright green artificial surfacing unlikely to have adverse impact on historic environment. Landscaping also unlikely to have adverse impact on the conservation area. Further floodlighting unlikely to have significant effect on the historic environment beyond the existing floodlighting. Change of roof form on officials' hut seems incongruous. Overall acceptable subject to condition requiring works to pavilion to match existing.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Tree Team)

- 6.19 No objection: while the loss of the large oak is regrettable, I confirm that the new layout will have less impact on the screening vegetation to the west and north and therefore the arboricultural character of the area. Conditions required on tree protection

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape Team)

- 6.20 The Landscape and Visual Appraisal was prepared in accordance with the guidelines of the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment. The Appraisal methodology is generally acceptable; some of the assumptions, conclusions and judgements are debatable, but the majority of the conclusions on the impact of the development are fair.
- 6.21 We have concerns regarding impact of the accumulation of sports lighting during the hours of darkness and the effect it has locally and in the wider Green Belt context. We recognise that there have

been improvements to the lighting proposals (LED lighting, a more flexible approach to zone lighting, and louvered lights to reduce impact), but regardless of the degree of additional impact, it is essential to achieve the best possible mitigation for the proposals. We would therefore ask for further mitigation in the form of additional and better considered planting on the western and southern boundaries to help soften the effects of both the lighting and the fencing.

6.22 At present the proposal includes the removal of a considerable amount of maturing vegetation but the sketchy proposal for mitigation merely adds plants in gaps in the boundary hedge. Ideally the boundary hedge should be made wider on the outer edge; if this is not possible, there is space to widen the hedge on the inner side.

6.23 The fencing colour should be changed from green to black or the underlying galvanised metal, either of which would be less noticeable against the sky.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Walking and Cycling Officer)

6.24 No objection, but alterations need to be made to proposed cycle parking areas.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Flood and Water Management)

6.25 No objection, subject to conditions to secure a surface water drainage scheme and the long-term maintenance of that scheme once implemented.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Sustainable Drainage Officer)

6.26 Acceptable subject to a surface water condition.

Head of Streets and Open Spaces (Nature Conservation Officer)

6.27 The principle of loss of habitats, principally scrub and grassland, is acceptable subject to mitigation. The habitats are common

nationally, but important locally; the loss on site has been minimised in the proposal. The proposed mitigation proposed in the original application is not sufficient to meet the requirements of the Framework; additional mitigation is required, and a landscape condition is necessary to secure these measures. Conditions are also necessary to safeguard protected species.

Senior Sustainable Development Officer

- 6.28 As previously advised, even though this is a major application, given that there are no substantial buildings involved with this proposal, application of policy 8/16 is not really pragmatic in this case. They have, however, incorporated energy efficiency measures into the scheme notably the use of LED floodlighting, which use 20-30% less energy than the floodlights used on the existing pitches
- 6.29 There are also plans to refurbish the pavilion, and while this falls outside the remit of this application, they are proposing to use this refurbishment as an opportunity to install water efficiency measures to the existing changing rooms and to investigate the use of solar thermal panels for provision of hot water to the changing rooms. I would be very supportive of this approach and am supportive of the application overall.

Sports and Recreation Manager

- 6.30 The City Council and South Cambridgeshire DC Playing Pitches Strategy covers the four main sports utilising open spaces for formal sport and recreation and the plans for hockey within the strategy clearly identify the need for three floodlit artificial sand based pitches and supporting infrastructure at the University's site at Wilberforce Road, as a key strategic priority to accommodate the existing demand and future growth of hockey in Cambridgeshire.
- 6.31 The Playing Pitches Strategy clearly identifies there is a current and future need for more sand dressed floodlit artificial pitches for hockey, with 46 teams (19 men's, 15 ladies' and 12 junior squads) currently active and playing in leagues around the City. Future growth in the demand for hockey utilising Sport England team generation modelling is predicting a further 8 teams being generated over coming years (3 men's, 1 ladies', and 4 junior

teams) taking the active levels up to 54 teams seeking facilities and match play times.

6.32 England Hockey is very supportive of 'hub-based' approaches where sites can accommodate multiple pitches and supporting facilities are available. This proposal provides such a 'hub' and is in line with their national plan and objectives to support the continued growth of hockey at all levels within Cambridgeshire.

6.33 The Playing Pitch Strategy identifies the development of Wilberforce Road as a key strategic priority in the adopted action plan. The additional pitches will provide for City and South Cambs based teams and leagues to be accommodated. This will deliver an objective of the City Council to work with the University estates to open up their facilities for more public use.

Sport England

6.34 Strong strategic support for the proposal. High priority for England Hockey. Benefits for hockey will outweigh the loss of the present grassed area. Possible benefits also for football as it would enable the resurfacing of the existing pitch at Abbey Leisure Centre. No objection.

Disability Consultative Panel (meeting of 31st January 2017)

6.35 The AGP surface would need to be wheelchair accessible as the surface would allow for year-round wheelchair games. The path from the car park would need to be made of a bound, non-slip surface.

6.36 Panel would emphasise the need in any future refurbishment of the changing facilities for a Changing Places WC.

6.37 As disabled team sports are growing in popularity, Panel welcome the expansion in pitch provision that will benefit not only the University but the wider community.

Access Officer

6.38 Supports the application

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

6.39 No objection to development. Recommend condition to secure scheme of archaeological investigation, and its implementation.

6.40 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 Representations in support of the application have been made by individuals at the following addresses.

in the city

31 Abbey Road	4 Nine Wells Road
9 Barrow Road	21 Ravensworth Gardens
35 Barrow Road	38 Rock Road
55 Barton Road	7 Rustat Avenue
40 Bermuda Terrace	68 St Barnabas Road
60 Blinco Grove	6 St George's Court
13 Bulstrode Gardens	15 St Thomas' Square
19 Chedworth Street	56 Scholars Walk
314 Cherry Hinton Road	18 Sedgwick Street
32 Chesterton Hall Crescent	21 Sedley Taylor Road
134 Coleridge Road	5 Storey's Way
40 Davy Road	3 Summerfield
9 Eltisley Avenue	Flat 1, 212 Victoria Road
27 Flack End	7 Wilberforce Road
71 Godwin Way	9 Wilberforce Road
69 Grange Road	14 Willers Lane
11 Gresham Place	1B Willow Walk
52 Gunhild Way	71 Woodlark Road
76 Hemingford Road	Wolfson College
108 High Street, Chesterton	12 Wootton Way
54 Hurrell Road	4 Wordsworth Grove
49 Mawson Road	
278a Mill Road	
32 Millington Road	
25 Montague Road	
5 Montgomery Road	
8 Morland Terrace	

in the rest of the sub-region

Aldwyke Cottage, Smiths End Lane, Barley
11 Comberton Road, Barton
11 Shangani Road, Bishops Stortford
35 Thornfield Road, Bishops Stortford
25 Beechwood Avenue, Bottisham
52 High Street, Bottisham
51 High Street, Bourn
The Old Store, High Street, Brinkley
The Old Stables, Berkeley House, Burwell
5 Kentwell Place, Burwell
100 Low Road, Burwell
Claytor, Bolts Hill, Castle Camps
12 Mandrill Close, Cherry Hinton
20 Green End, Comberton
Binbrook Barn, Northfield Farm, Comberton
Manor Barn, South Street, Comberton
140 High Street, Cottenham
View Farm House, Park Lane, Dry Drayton
30 Ringstone, Duxford
53 High Street, Earith
12 Chesterfield Way, Eynesbury
3 Wright's Close, Fen Ditton (2)
52 Haggis Gap, Fulbourn
135 High Street, Girton
13 Burnt Close, Grantchester
13 Grain Close, Great Shelford
Longacre, Haverhill Road, Great Shelford
56 Angle End, Great Wilbraham
Hadstock House, Walden Road, Hadstock
8 Main Street, Hardwick
12 Haslingfield Road, Harlton
6 Trinity Close, Haslingfield
14 Scott's Crescent, Hilton
Hinxton Court, Hinxton
3A St Peter's Road, Huntingdon
28 Mill Lane, Impington
16 Percheron Close, Impington
107 Waterbeach Road, Landbeach (2)
4 Cooper's Court, Linton
5 Abbots Close, Litlington
The Elephant House, Little Raveley

40 Camel Road, Littleport
1-3 Hauxton Road, Little Shelford
16 Hauxton Road, Little Shelford
26 Hauxton Road, Little Shelford
68 High Street, Little Shelford
31 Magdalene Close, Longstanton
Elm Cottage, The Avenue, Madingley
4 New Road, Melbourn
18 Stamford Street, Newmarket
The Cottage, Fowlmere Road, Newton
68 Town Street, Newton
12 South Park Drive, Papworth Everard
Lakeside Lodge Health Club, Fen Road, Pidley
7 Bentley Close, Ramsey
170 Herne Road, Ramsey St Mary's
33 Burwell Road, Reach
19 Orchard Way, Royston
24 Piper's Close, Royston
3 Sun Court, Gold Street, Saffron Walden
7 Gorse Way, St Ives
9 Skylark Close, St Ives
25 Wren Close, St Ives
Field House, Shingay-cum-Wendy
65 High Street, Stretham
50 Lower End, Swaffham Prior (2)
Lily Hill House, Manor Farm Road, Waresley (2)
1 West End, Whittlesford
Thornbery Hill Farm, Wimpole
Cambs Past Present and Future

further afield

54 Wilmot Way, Banstead
17 Tivoli Crescent, Brighton
24 Lancashire Road, Bristol
58 Emsworth Close, Bury St. Edmunds
21 Fordington Dairy, Dorchester
134 Whispering Pines, Jumeriah Estates, Dubai
Hope Cottage, Shantock Hall Lane, Bovingdon, Hemel
Hempstead
20B Hailey Lane, Hertford
van Yussumlaan 1, Hilversum, Netherlands
69 Church Road, Tilney St. Lawrence, Kings Lynn
1 Brabant Road, Aigburth, Liverpool

1506 Canaletto, 257 City Road, London EC1
27 Langford Green, London SE5
45 Roseneath Road, London SW11
187 Boundaries Road, London SW12
14 Beech Court, Arterberry Road, London SW20
11 Spencer Mansions, Queens Club Gardens, London W14
50 East 28th St, New York City, USA
10 Arthur Street, Nottingham
79 Bridge Street, Oxford
101 Hyholmes, Bretton, Peterborough
132 Northfield Road, Peterborough
15 Park Home Ave., Peterborough
Dorset Magna, Rowe Lane, Pirbright
80 Kings Road, Reading
10 The Butchery, Sandwich
24 Ashdell Road, Sheffield
59 North Street, Stilton
221 Raeburn Avenue, Surbiton
41 Lower Green, Tewin, Welwyn Garden City
80 Wellcroft Road, Welwyn Garden City
14 Hazeldene Road, Weston-super-Mare
10 Oakfield Place, Witney

7.2 Representations in support of the application have also been made by the following organizations.

Ashford (Middlesex) Hockey Club
Bishops Stortford Hockey Club
Cambridge South Hockey Club
Cambridge University Hockey Club (with petition of 36 signatures)
Cambridgeshire Hockey (2)
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Sports Partnership
City of Peterborough Hockey Club
East Region Hockey Association
East Region Hockey Umpires Association
Edgbaston Hockey Club
England Hockey
Exeter University
Middlesex Hockey Association
Northampton Hockey Club
Royston Hockey Club
St Ives Hockey Club
Wimbledon Hockey Club

7.3 The representations in support can be summarised as follows:

- Would make good use of existing ground and facilities, avoiding the need to build elsewhere
- Lack of facilities at present
- In line with English Hockey's national strategy
- Hockey participation growing, especially amongst children (80% for U16's in five years)
- Help in fight against obesity
- Would enable more participation (including adults who have not played since school)
- Would help to accommodate growing hockey participation at schools level
- Would address present particular shortage of facilities for girls
- Would benefit many children who do not have facilities for hockey in their own schools
- Current shortage of pitches results in late training times and lack of playing opportunities, deterring girls from continuing in the sport
- Cambridge City is a particularly large club – this would help to meet current and future demand for pitch time
- Would enable more opportunities for coaching
- Particularly difficult to organize large courses for children without a multi-pitch venue
- Improved opportunities for umpire training
- Would greatly facilitate organization of youth competitions for clubs and schools
- Would reduce traffic through the city by enabling tournaments to use a smaller number of locations
- Would be very helpful to home and visiting teams when multiple teams are involved, enabling players to change, shower and take refreshments at the same location as playing
- Would help to make Cambridge a regional centre for sport, including disabled sport
- County and regional events, summer camps, specialist club training sessions and national performance centres could be held
- Would enable Cambridge more closely to emulate the standard of sports provision available elsewhere in Europe
- Would attract people to live, work and study in the area
- Would enable more prestigious tournaments to take place

- Social benefits of more participation
- Partnership between hockey club, University, and other partners should act as blueprint for future community-led projects
- Hockey 'hub' will encourage more social interaction, more spectating and volunteering, and growth of a community
- Pitches can be used for other sports such as lacrosse, football, ultimate frisbee, rounders and tennis
- Sustainable location
- Has considered needs of neighbours
- Many players cycle, so increase in motor traffic would be limited
- More pitches would reduce the need for activity to go on late
- Restrictions should not be placed on hours of floodlighting

7.4 A petition of 100 signatures in support of the application was received on 4th March 2017

7.5 Representations objecting to the application, or seeking conditions have been made by individuals at the following addresses.

10 Adams Road
 11 Clarkson Road
 7 Dane Drive
 75 Gough Way
 21 Wilberforce Road

and by North Newnham Residents' Association

7.6 The representations objecting or requiring conditions can be summarised as follows:

- Light pollution will add to existing blighting of area
- Light spillage should be minimised
- Long hours of use
- Lighting should not be permitted after 2200
- Existing tree screening is ineffectual because of poor planning, implementation and maintenance
- Slow-growing native tree species not appropriate for screening
- Harm to wildlife corridor
- Mitigation measures on light and noise not sufficient
- Mitigation measures on habitat loss insufficient

- Increased traffic
- Hazard to safety at site entrance
- Noise from hockey balls striking backboards
- Backboard noise should be addressed by dampners
- Noise from public address system
- Need for bus parking
- Need for adequate bus cornering and turning space
- Additional car parking would attract more traffic
- One-way traffic in Adams, Wilberforce and Clarkson Roads should be used when events are staged
- Pitch at Abbey Leisure centre could be retained instead of Pitch 3
- Development, if permitted, should be staggered, with floodlighting on Pitch 3 not permitted until successful landscape screening has been demonstrated
- Wide geographic spread of responses in support suggests a coercive campaign
- Application ignores impact of further growth of University West Cambridge site
- Application ignores potential route for guided busway alongside site
- No attempt to increase cycle access to the site from other directions
- Travel data is insufficient
- Destination of surface water runoff not identified
- Risk of pollution from chemical cleaning of AGPs
- University fortunate to have existing permission

7.7 Representations objecting to the application have also been made by Cambridge Past Present and Future.

7.8 The objections in this representation can be summarised as follows:

- Habitat loss will not be mitigated by proposed landscaping (contrary to paras 109 and 118 of the Framework). Alternatives are required.
- Visual impact of lighting could be reduced by reducing number of poles, reducing height of poles, using poles which could be lowered, or replacing existing lighting with more modern versions.
- Trumpington Sporting Village application might render additional pitches superfluous to need.

7.9 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

Introduction

8.1 The planning history relating to all-weather pitches and floodlighting on this site is fairly long and complex, dating back to 1992. In 1993 Planning Committee granted permission under C/92/0305/FP for the current athletics track, the pavilion, and two all-weather pitches. One such pitch was constructed, and remains in use. The second all-weather pitch has never been put in place, but as the rest of the development has been implemented, the permission for the second pitch remains extant. In 1999, Planning Committee granted permission (C/99/0253/FP) for eight 16m high floodlight columns. This permission was subject to a legal agreement which required the columns to be demounted between 5 May and 5 October each year.

8.2 In 2007 a new application was made under 07/0939/FUL to erect floodlights to serve the athletics track and both the existing and unimplemented all-weather pitches. The floodlights in this application were to remain in place all the year round. Planning Committee granted permission for these lights in February 2008. The lights serving the athletics track and the existing hockey pitch were erected; permission for the floodlights for the as-yet-unimplemented second hockey pitch remains extant. This permission has established the principle that permanent all-year-round floodlights for sports pitches in this location within the Green Belt are compliant with planning policy.

8.3 In this context, and in the light of consultation responses and representations received and my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Principle of development - need
2. Principle of development - Green Belt
3. Context of site and design

4. Renewable energy
5. Sustainable drainage
6. Disabled access
7. Trees
8. Nature conservation
9. Residential amenity
10. Traffic and highway safety
11. Car, cycle and bus parking
12. Third party representations

Principle of Development - Need

- 8.4 Policy 6/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 states that the improvement of a leisure facility (defined as including those for outdoor sport) will be permitted if it improves the range and quality of facilities and is an appropriate scale for the locality. Paragraph 6.7 of the supporting text specifically notes that intensive-use sports facilities such as floodlit multi-use games areas and synthetic turf pitches contribute greatly to sports development, and proposals for these will be supported providing that there would not be undue intrusion or significant adverse impact on the immediate locality or wider environment. Paragraph 73 of the Framework emphasises the contribution which access to high quality opportunities for sport and recreation can make to the health and well-being of communities, and advises robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for sport and recreation facilities should be used to determine what provision is needed.
- 8.5 The Greater Cambridge Area Playing Pitch Strategy 2015-2031 includes a full assessment of the existing hockey pitch provision in the area and the present and likely demand. It identifies a significant shortfall in the existing provision, and identifies the provision of two additional floodlit artificial grass pitches (AGPs) at the University Athletic Ground as a Level 1 priority, which should be delivered or worked towards within the first three years from 2015
- 8.6 Representations suggest that retention of the existing AGP at Abbey Leisure Centre or the creation of a Sporting Village in Trumpington might eliminate the need for further pitches. There is no certainty that the Trumpington Sporting Village project will be realised given that this is not an allocated site in the Local Plan. An application for the Sporting Village is currently under

consideration by the Councils, but it is unlikely that officers will be able to support it given that it is a Departure application. Officers do not support the development of additional hockey provision in Trumpington, because the Playing Pitches Strategy has clearly identified Wilberforce Road as the appropriate site for such development and a top priority within the Strategy. The possibility of resurfacing the AGP at Abbey Leisure Centre to help meet the need for pitches for football is noted in the Playing Pitches Strategy as a benefit of providing additional hockey pitches at Wilberforce Road, and this benefit is confirmed by Sport England's advice above on the present application.

- 8.7 This proposal is based on a very thorough assessment of the need for the AGPs and their associated floodlighting, (an assessment supported by considerable anecdotal evidence in third party comments). In my opinion, it would significantly improve the range, accessibility, and quality of facilities, it would enhance sporting provision by maximising the use of an existing facility, and it is of an appropriate scale for the locality. Subject to an assessment against Green Belt policy, the principle of the development is acceptable and in accordance with policy 6/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and paragraphs 73 and 74 of the Framework.

Principle of development - Green Belt

- 8.7 The national planning policy context for development in Green Belts is Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). Paragraph 79 of the Framework states that the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. Paragraph 80 adds that the purposes of including land within the Green Belt are to prevent sprawl, assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and to preserve the setting of historic towns. Paragraph 81 notes that land within designated Green Belts has a positive role to play fulfilling a number of objectives, including the provision of opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas.
- 8.8 Paragraph 87 states a presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Paragraph 89 sets a general rule that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate, but sets out a number of exceptions to this rule, one of which is the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor

sport and recreation, provided that they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

- 8.9 Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/1 also notes the general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt, but in the supporting text notes that consideration must be given to national planning policy guidance.
- 8.10 The Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (November 2015) defines three purposes for the Cambridge Green Belt:
- To preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre
 - To maintain and enhance the quality of its setting
 - To prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the city
- 8.11 I have indicated above that in my view the provision of the AGP's and associated floodlights is an appropriate facility for outdoor sport, and is based on a very robust assessment of the need in the sub-region. The proposal must also be assessed against the need to preserve openness, and the need to avoid conflict with the three relevant purposes of including land in the Green Belt

Impact on openness

- 8.12 I accept the applicants' assertion that the role this site currently plays in maintaining openness is relatively limited, because views into it from the public realm are partly or wholly screened, or (from the west) are mostly from quite distant viewpoints. Nonetheless, it does have some role in preserving the openness of the area. The two proposed pitches would not have any impact on openness. The structures proposed are 16 lighting columns (eight of them in locations around Pitch 2, where extant permission exists), and 5m high ball-catching fences around Pitches 2 and 3. (I address the issue of lighting itself elsewhere – it is not pertinent to the question of openness.) The structures proposed are slender and lightweight. They would not involve any bulky form, or give a strong sense of visual enclosure, and the prominence of the fences would be reduced by existing and proposed planting. Planting would also have some screening effect on the

proposed lighting columns, although even at maturity, it would still leave the columns visible from the public realm to a significant degree. However, I do not consider that the slender forms of floodlight columns have any significant impact on openness.

Preventing sprawl and protection of countryside from encroachment

- 8.13 The Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2015 notes that sports pitches are one of the features of this sub-area of the Green Belt, and that they form part of a partial green corridor. This site is already in use as an athletic ground, although there are no specific facilities (apart from the hammer-throwing cage) installed on the western part of the site at present, and this part is characterised by mown grass and shrub/tree planting. The trees and shrubs on site are not protected, however, and this part of the site could be reconfigured as a grass playing pitch without the need for planning permission. Currently, the western part of the site has a sylvan, semi-suburban character, similar to parts of the Grange Road area to the east, but it could not correctly be described as 'countryside'. I am of the view that an additional hockey pitch in this part of the site would not alter its contribution to this sub-area of the Green Belt, and would not result in encroachment into the countryside.

Setting of the city

- 8.14 The Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2015 emphasises the significance of Sector 3 (into which this site falls) in abutting, and providing a short approach to, the historic core, and in giving key views of the city. Lighting columns are already a feature of this site, but they do not form a foreground to any significant views of the city. The Landscape Visual Assessment (LVA) which accompanies the application includes photographic and CGI images of the site from 900m west of the boundary along the Coton footpath, both existing and proposed. The LVA also includes photographs of the site at present from a wide range of viewpoints to the west of the city. These images demonstrate that from this viewpoint, both existing and proposed lighting columns, although perceptible, are too slight a form to have any salience in the landscape or compete with, or detract from the key landmarks such as the towers of the

University Library and the Church of Our Lady and the English Martyrs. Once an observer approaching the city from the west is close enough for the lighting columns to be prominent, the landmarks of the historic core are hidden by trees in the Grange Road area. I am of the view that this screening of the central landmarks occurs to a considerable degree even in the winter, because of the density of planting.

- 8.15 The LVA also includes views of the proposed floodlights in daylight, at dusk and in darkness, from a viewpoint on the Coton footpath 250m west of the site boundary, and from the Bin Brook, 300m south-east of the site. The CGI images in both cases show that the proposed new columns would be clearly visible during daylight, and the additional luminaires would feature clearly in views during dusk and darkness. However, extant permission already exists for floodlights on Pitch 2, and the proposed Pitch 3 floodlights would be closely grouped with the existing and previously-permitted columns in the landscape.
- 8.16 I acknowledge the strongly-expressed concerns about the negative visual impact of the proposed floodlights in representations, and I agree that there would be some negative visual impact from eight additional columns and luminaire clusters, and from the light they would emit at night, even in the context of 28 existing or permitted units. In my view however, this impact would be limited and would be reduced, in time, by the effect of planting. I do not consider that it would cause significant harm to the setting of the city, or alter the extent to which this area provides a short approach to the historic core. The visual impact of the pitch surfaces, fencing, pitch surrounds, additional parking area, alterations to the pavilion and new substation would be minimal. I do not consider they would have any impact on the setting of the city.
- 8.17 The whole of the University Athletic Ground has been in recreational use for a considerable period of time. The athletics track, jumping runways and pits, one AGP and 20 floodlight columns associated with these facilities are already in place, and permission exists for a second AGP and eight further lighting columns. The area on which this application seeks permission for a third floodlit pitch contains the throwing cage, and is already used for hammer, shot and discus throwing in practice and competition. I do not consider that the proposal would lead to loss of openness, sprawl, encroachment into the

countryside, or harm to the setting of the historic city. The application has demonstrated a clear need for the proposed sports facilities, including the additional floodlighting and the extended hours of floodlighting, which is supported by the Council's Playing Pitches Strategy and by Sport England.

8.18 For all these reasons, I have not considered the proposal to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and in my opinion, a justification of 'very special circumstances', as set out in Paragraph 87 of the Framework is not required. However, were this interpretation to be questioned, and the proposal therefore considered to be 'inappropriate development in the Green Belt' it is my view that very special circumstances to justify the application would exist. Those circumstances are:

- The very robustly demonstrated need for additional hockey pitch provision in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire
- The emphasis in Paragraph 73 of the Framework on the contribution made by opportunities for sport and recreation to the health and well-being of communities
- The fact that the two councils' Playing Pitches Strategy not only identifies this site as one of the two appropriate locations for additional hockey pitch provision, but identifies the development of the facility as a high priority
- The firm support of Sport England for the proposal

8.19 Consequently, in my view, the proposal is in accordance with policy 4/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and with paragraphs 80, 81, 87 and 89 of the Framework,

Context of site and design

Proposed new playing surfaces

8.20 The proposed pitches would have the typical appearance of an AGP. The bright blue colour of the pitch surround contrasts to a degree with the grass and natural planting which forms the background, but in my view this causes no harm to the sports field character of the area, and is in any case, only perceptible only from close quarters or in an aerial view. The impact of the pitches themselves would be negligible, and in my view this aspect of the proposal is fully in accordance with policies 3/4 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Fences

- 8.21 5m high ball-stop fences are proposed around both the proposed new pitches and around the existing Pitch 1. These are utilitarian rigid metal mesh fences with a grid size small enough to prevent the penetration of a hockey ball. They have a strong visual presence from close quarters, but would be less prominent from public realm viewpoints because of their transparency, their distance, their relatively limited height, and a degree of screening from existing structures and proposed and existing planting. In my view they are of an appropriate design for this sports field context, and not likely to have any significantly harmful visual impact. Subject to a condition to ensure the use of black or very dark green paint, which would minimise their visibility, the fences would be in accordance with policy 3/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Lighting columns

- 8.22 The proposed lighting columns (eight more than already permitted) would be slender structures. I have already indicated above that the columns and luminaire clusters would have some negative visual impact. In the context of close proximity to existing floodlights, however, it is my view that this impact would be very limited, and that the columns and luminaire clusters would be in accordance with policy 3/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Car and cycle parking spaces

- 8.23 The additional car and cycle parking spaces proposed would have only very limited visibility except from close quarters. I do not consider they would have any harmful impact.

Alterations to the pavilion

- 8.24 At present, the pavilion has a timber balcony with balustrade, supported by timber uprights at first-floor level. This structure extends for approximately 8m around the north end of the building, from the mid-point of the east elevation to the mid-point of the west elevation. The proposal would extend this balcony, in the same form, for a further 13m down the west face of the building. In my view this would be entirely in keeping with

the existing building, and in accordance with policies 3/4 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Alterations to scorers' hut

- 8.25 The scorers' hut is a very small projection from the north elevation of the existing pavilion (5m high, 2.4m wide and 2m deep). It is reached by a short external staircase. The hut currently has a pitched roof; it would be replaced by a flat roof. Although the present pitched roof echoes the pitches elsewhere on the building, the roof of this projection is seen against the background of the horizontal balcony and rectangular windows. I note the adverse comments of the conservation officer about this element of the proposal, but given the very limited size of this amendment relative to the whole building, I do not consider that the use of a flat roof here would significantly detract from the appearance of the building. In my view this alteration is in accordance with policies 3/4 and 3/14 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

New sub-station

- 8.26 The proposed new sub-station would be sited alongside the driveway from the site entrance to the pavilion. It would be a brick structure measuring 4m x 4.7m, and approximately 2.5m high, although the precise height and roof design are unclear from the submitted drawings. The building would be visible from the site entrance at Adams Road/Wilberforce Road, but it would be 40m from this junction, and would in my view have very low visual prominence. A condition is necessary to control the roof design, but I consider this building to be in accordance with policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Landscaping

- 8.27 The proposal includes additional landscaping, including structural planting in gaps in the existing boundary hedges, additional ground cover shrub planting around the overflow car park, and enhanced planting in the area around the northern pond in an area currently of low ecological value. In my view, the design of this landscaping maintains and enhances the

landscape quality of the site. Subject to conditions, the landscape proposals are considered appropriate by the landscape and nature conservation officers, and in my view, the landscaping proposals are in accordance with policies 3/2 and 3/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Renewable energy and sustainability

- 8.28 Although this is a major application, it is not practicable to apply policy 8/16 because virtually no buildings are proposed. The application has sought to reduce energy use by the type of lighting selected, and the applicant has indicated an intention to improve the sustainability of the pavilion building in future plans for alterations to the building. The Senior Sustainable Development Officer supports the proposal.
- 8.29 Although the proposal is not strictly in accordance with the letter of Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/16, I concur with the Senior Sustainable Development Officer that it is not practicable to require such adherence on a proposal of this type without any buildings. In my view, the applicants have suitably addressed the issue of sustainability and the principles and objectives of the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2007.

Sustainable drainage

- 8.30 I accept the advice of the sustainable drainage officer and the lead local flood authority that a condition requiring the submission and implementation of an acceptable surface water drainage scheme is a sufficient safeguard to ensure sustainable drainage, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/16.

Disabled access

- 8.31 The new pitches will all have level thresholds and a bound, non-slip surface which is suitable for all-year round wheelchair hockey. The spectator areas will accommodate wheelchairs. 7 new disabled car parking spaces will be provided in close proximity to the pavilion
- 8.32 The Access Officer and Disability Access Panel both support the application, and in my opinion the proposal is compliant,

with respect to inclusive access, with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Light

- 8.33 An Obtrusive Light Report (OLR) has been submitted with the application. The environmental health team advise that this report is comprehensive and in accordance with national technical and best practice standards and guidance. It considers the cumulative impact of the floodlighting to all three pitches (one existing, two proposed).
- 8.34 The application includes a number of measures designed to reduce the obtrusive impact of floodlighting:
- 15m-high columns allow a more acute tilt angle of luminaires to reduce glare outside the pitch area
 - Proposed lights have narrow beams to concentrate light on the pitch area only
 - Louvres are proposed to minimise light spill
 - Lights are dimmable and can be operated at lower levels for training
 - Lights can be switched on in thirds to light specific areas where whole pitches are not required
 - Timers will provide automatic cut-off at the end of permitted hours
- 8.35 The proposed floodlights on Pitch 3, which are the only ones for which permission does not already exist, would be 90m from the nearest houses in Perry Court, and 280m from the nearest house in Adams Road.
- 8.36 The proposed lighting scheme will comply fully with the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Obtrusive Light Limitations for a location in the E2 category. E2 zones are rural surroundings with low district brightness such as a village or a relatively dark suburban location. I also note that the OLR modelling of light levels to existing premises does not take account of any physical obstructions such as trees or fences, and that actual light levels at existing premises are likely to be lower than given.

8.37 In view of the compliance of this application with ILP guidance for E2 dark suburban or village locations, I accept the advice of the environmental health team that the impact of the proposed floodlights on residential amenity and quality of life is acceptable.

8.38 The application proposes that the permitted hours of floodlight use on the three pitches be extended from the existing hours permitted for Pitch 1 in three ways:

- Floodlight use to be permitted from noon onwards on any six days in a given week (rather than from 1430 onwards as at present), to improve safety in poor weather and light conditions.
- Floodlight use to be permitted on all Wednesdays and Saturdays until 1900 (rather than until 1830 as at present)
- Floodlight use between 1830 and 2130 to be permitted on any five evenings other than Sunday* in any week (rather than any four evenings as at present)

(* The environmental health officer has raised a query about whether evening use of the floodlights on Sundays is proposed, but in my view, it is clear that the application does not seek to alter the existing prohibition on floodlighting after 1830 on Sundays, and the continuance of this prohibition can be secured by condition.)

8.39 A number of neighbour representations argue strongly that there should be no extension of the existing permitted hours for floodlighting. However, I do not consider that the facility to use the lights early in the afternoon in poor weather is likely to have any significant impact, because the light emitted would have relatively low prominence in daylight, even when it is overcast. Given the compliance of the application with ILP guidance for E2 areas, I do not consider that either of the other two proposed extensions to permitted hours (a half hour extra on Wednesdays and Saturdays, and one additional evening use in the week) are unreasonable.

8.40 I do not consider that additional mitigation against obtrusive light is required. Nor do I consider that it would be reasonable to delay the construction of Pitch 3 while the mitigating effect of new landscaping was assessed. In my opinion the proposal as submitted adequately respects the residential amenity of its

neighbours in respect of obtrusive light and I consider that in this respect it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 4/13, and 4/15, and the guidance in Paragraph 125 of the Framework.

Noise

- 8.41 Since permission for AGP surface and floodlighting on Pitch 2 already exists, the assessment of noise impact from the present proposal must focus on the different impact which would arise from the creation of Pitch 3. Concerns about noise from practice and matches on Pitch 3 must also be considered against the potential for changes on this part of the site which do not require planning permission. The Pitch 3 area currently accommodates the athletics throwing cage and throwing area, and is used for shot, discus and hammer throwing. The trees on this part of the site are not protected. It would be possible, without any permission, for trees and shrubs on this part of the site to be removed and the area prepared and marked out as a pitch for football or other ball sports. I recognize that no permission for floodlights on this part of the site exists at present, and therefore the area could not be used after dusk. I also recognize that there are no backboard impact noises from football. However, this area could be used in daylight hours for football, for example, an activity which would generate the same noise, or possibly greater noise, from shouting, whistles and spectators as hockey. I note also that the main difference, in noise generation terms, between this 'fallback' position and the present application, i.e. winter evenings requiring floodlighting, would affect nearby residents during the time of year when they would be least likely to be using outdoor space, and least likely to have windows open.
- 8.42 The main concern of the environmental health team about noise impact has been with respect to the impact of hockey on the proposed Pitch 3 on the residents of 6-12 Perry Court, because this pitch would be closer to these premises than the existing or previously approved AGPs or the athletics track. It is noted that the submitted noise assessment, which the environmental health officer considers to be generally acceptable, concludes that the '*overall noise level from AGP use*' will be below the 50dBLAeq level which is recommended by the World Health

Organization to prevent annoyance to nearby residents and is therefore acceptable.

- 8.43 The overall noise level is not the most important issue, however. Advice from the environmental health officer is that in the case of sports pitches, the factors most likely to cause disturbance and annoyance to nearby residents are not overall noise levels, but the number, frequency and pattern of 'individual maximum impulsive noise' occurrences, which in this case would come from impacts of stick on ball and stick on stick, balls hitting backboards and boundaries, whistles, and the shouting of players, officials and spectators. The applicants have also submitted information assessing this element of noise (measured in 'dB LAmax fast' levels), and, in response to concerns expressed by the environmental health team, provided additional information on the baseline levels of dB LA max which were used in the noise assessment. The information concludes that the likely levels of individual maximum impact noise would not be above the existing levels.
- 8.44 The environmental health officer has examined this information, and his conclusion is that while he agrees with the assessment of baseline and likely dB LA max levels, the nature and frequency of impulsive noise from hockey would have a different impact from the noises included in the baseline, which are likely to have been from aeroplanes and helicopters, bird noise, dogs barking and pedestrians and cyclists using the Coton footpath. For this reason, he is of the view that, notwithstanding the conclusions of the noise assessment, some additional restrictions on the use of Pitch 3, particularly with respect to evening use at weekends, are required to avoid unacceptable noise impact.
- 8.45 The conclusion of the environmental health officer on this aspect of noise is that the impact on residents of Perry Court would not be at unacceptable levels, provided that the mitigating measures submitted in the application are implemented, that Pitch 3 is not used in the later part of the evening on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays, and that restrictions are in place to prevent other more noisy sports (particularly football and rugby) from taking place on these pitches. I accept his advice on this issue. However, although a prohibition on football and rugby is sufficient to avoid unacceptably noisy activities on Pitch 2, the proximity of Perry

Court to Pitch 3 requires a different approach. I accept the contention of the applicant that to prohibit any sport other than hockey on this pitch would be unreasonable, but the menu of acceptable sports here needs to be carefully controlled, especially with respect to the summer months when a demand for activities other than hockey may exist, but must be balanced against the likelihood of neighbouring residents using their outdoor space more extensively. I recommend a condition to secure this control. I am also of the view that as an additional measure to limit possible noise impacts, use of Pitch 3 should only be permitted when Pitches 1 and 2 are already in use, and that when partial use takes place on Pitch 3, the southern end should be used rather than the northern end. I also recommend that the use of Pitch 3 in the evenings be restricted to the same number of days as floodlighting is allowed, to prevent use in the summer months being more intensive than in the winter.

8.46 I address the issue of the impact of the application on traffic below under that heading. The environmental health team have not expressed concerns about noise from traffic, and I do not consider that any increase in traffic to the site is likely to have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity.

8.47 In my opinion, subject to the conditions recommended, the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours with respect to noise and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 4/13, and the guidance in paragraph 124 of the Framework.

Trees

8.48 I agree with the arboricultural officer's advice that although the loss of a large oak is regrettable, the impact of the proposal on the arboricultural character of the area is acceptable. I recommend tree protection conditions in line with the arboricultural officer's advice.

Nature conservation

8.49 The provision of the additional AGP involves the loss of some habitats, principally scrub areas. The initial view of the nature conservation officer was that this was acceptable in principle subject to appropriate mitigation, but that the mitigation proposed in the application as submitted was not sufficient. The

applicant has subsequently submitted a revised scheme for mitigation, with which the nature conservation officer is satisfied. A condition is necessary to ensure that the submitted mitigation is maintained or replaced in the future.

- 8.50 The nature conservation officer is also satisfied that the welfare of protected species on the site can be adequately protected by appropriate conditions. I accept this advice and recommend the conditions he has suggested. Subject to these conditions, in my opinion, the application is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/3 and 4/7, and with guidance in paragraphs 109 and 118 of the Framework.

Traffic and highway safety

- 8.51 I accept that the additional pitch sought in this application above what has extant permission may lead to some increase in traffic to the site. However, the application, and many of the representations in support suggest that increased traffic associated with the potential to accommodate more matches may be offset by a number of factors. These include:

- Drivers bringing several hockey players to practice or to matches may currently have to drive to Wilberforce Road and then to one or more other sites because of the need to use pitches elsewhere in the city alongside this site for both fixtures involving several teams and training for different age groups or competence levels. This pattern would be reduced by the concentration of hockey activity on this site.
- At present, players and officials often return to Wilberforce Road from other hockey pitches after matches for refreshments and socializing. This pattern would be significantly reduced if there were three AGP's on this site.
- It is the case that a significant proportion of users are likely to travel by cycle. I acknowledge that representations from across the sub-region demonstrate that there are many potential users who will live much too far from the city to cycle, but many will live much closer, and the nature of the activity and the age-range of participants both increase the likelihood of cycle use.

- 8.52 The highway authority has not raised concerns about any unacceptable impact on the highway network either locally or city-wide. I do not consider that the traffic implications of the proposal are likely to be unacceptable
- 8.53 The highway authority has not raised concerns about highway safety, and I accept their advice. Neighbour representations raise concerns about conflicting traffic flows at the corner of Wilberforce Road and the manner in which these might be exacerbated by further developments on the University's West Cambridge site, or by the potential routing of a new guided busway through this point. I accept that cycle traffic along Adams Road and the Coton footpath is heavy, but, even taking the likelihood of increased cycle traffic into account, I do not consider that this makes the corner dangerous. Neither the highway authority nor the cycling officer has expressed any concern about this issue. If this junction were eventually to be selected as the start point for a guided busway towards Cambourne, the design of that junction would have to take into account traffic flows by all modes through this point, including those to the University Athletic Ground. The present development would not obstruct the use of this route for a busway, but the route is currently only one possibility within an identified corridor, and it would not be reasonable to limit or refuse the proposal because of the manner in which it might influence the design of a potential junction in the future.
- 8.54 Given the highway authority's position, with which I agree, I do not consider there is any need to develop alternative cycle routes into the University Athletic Ground, as is suggested in neighbour representations.
- 8.55 I note neighbour concerns about cornering space for buses. This is also a matter on which the highway authority has not raised concerns. My inspection of the site suggests that the access point can be negotiated by buses. I acknowledge that there may have been occasions when inconsiderate parking, or unfamiliarity with the location on the part of coach drivers has led to difficulties, but I do not consider that the present application is likely to lead to a significant increase in such incidents and I do not consider that it would be a reason to refuse or to place additional conditions on the application.

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

Cycle, car and bus parking

8.57 The cycling officer has agreed that the level of additional cycle parking proposed is adequate for the additional use expected. She has suggested that minor improvements to layout are necessary to ensure the cycle parking functions effectively. I agree with this view, and I recommend a condition to ensure the necessary amendments are made.

8.58 Additional car parking spaces are proposed. This is not in conflict with the aspiration of the local plan to reduce non-residential car parking space, because the area is available for, and is currently used as, informal car parking space. There would be no increase in actual car parking capacity. Representations have raised concerns about car parking in adjacent streets, and suggested that increased car parking on site is required. I do not agree with this view. Neighbouring streets lie outside the controlled parking zone, and there are significant areas of uncontrolled car parking space on-street. This space could be occupied by those engaged in hockey activities, but the on-street parking space is available to visitors and commuters, and is consequently filled for most of the day, at weekends as well as during the week. The present proposal is unlikely to make any difference to this situation.

8.59 In my view the site has adequate space for parking buses or coaches. I agree that accommodating such vehicles in a way which minimises inconvenience for others using the ground, and those outside, requires sensible management by those organizing events, but I have no reason to suppose that this will not be done, and the magnitude of this issue is likely to increase only slightly as a result of the additional pitch sought in this application. I also accept that buses or coaches might park on-street, but this is a consequence of the uncontrolled parking status of some nearby streets, which I have addressed above.

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

Third Party Representations

8.61 I address the issues raised in representations objecting to, or requiring conditions on, the application, in the table below. Where I have covered the issue in an earlier section of my report, I indicate the paragraph number(s).

Lighting issues	
Light pollution will add to existing blighting of area	8.33, 8.34, 8.36, 8.37, 8.40
Light spillage should be minimised	8.34, 8.36, 8.37, 8.40
Long hours of use	8.36-8.39. Condition 16
Lighting should not be permitted after 2200	Condition 16
Mitigation measures not sufficient	8.34, 8.37, 8.40
Visual impact of lighting could be reduced by reducing number of poles, reducing height of poles, using poles which could be lowered, or replacing existing lighting with more modern versions.	8.16
Development, if permitted, should be staggered, with floodlighting on Pitch 3 not permitted until successful landscape screening has been demonstrated	8.36, 8.37, 8.40
Noise issues	
Noise from hockey balls striking backboards	8.43-8.45 and Conditions 8 and 9
Noise from public address system	Condition 10
Long hours of use	8.41, 8.45, 8.47 and Conditions 9, 12, 13, 14 and 16
Mitigation measures not sufficient	8.41, 8.45, 8.47 and Conditions 8-9
Landscape and nature conservation issues	
Harm to wildlife corridor	8.49, 8.50
Mitigation measures on habitat loss insufficient	8.49, 8.50 and Conditions 19 and 20
Highways and parking issues	
Increased traffic	8.51, 8.52
Additional car parking would attract more traffic	8.58

One-way traffic system for events required	8.51, 8.52, 8.53
Need for bus parking	8.59
Need for bus cornering and turning space	8.55
Hazard to safety at site entrance	8.53
Application ignores impact of further growth of University West Cambridge site	8.53
Application ignores potential route for guided busway alongside site	8.53
No attempt to increase cycle access to the site from other directions	8.54
Travel data is insufficient	8.51, 8.52
Alternative provision	
Pitch at Abbey Leisure centre could be retained instead of Pitch 3	8.6
Trumpington Sporting Village application might render additional pitches superfluous to need.	8.6
Drainage issues	
Destination of surface water runoff not identified	8.30 and Condition 22
Risk of pollution from chemical cleaning of AGPs	The applicants have confirmed that no chemical cleaning is required and none will take place.
Process	
Wide geographic spread of responses in support suggests a coercive campaign	There is no evidence to suggest that the volume of responses in support has resulted from coercion

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 It is my view that this proposal is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt because it seeks to provide appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and recreation for which there is a

proven need, and it meets the conditions set out in Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 9.2 Having received detailed advice from the relevant consultees, and taken into consideration the additional information submitted by the applicants, I am of the opinion that any harmful impacts on nature conservation and landscape are limited in scale, and can successfully be mitigated, subject to the recommended conditions. I also consider that the conditions I have recommended are sufficient to protect nearby residents from any unacceptable impact on their amenity from obtrusive noise or artificial light.
- 9.3 The application would provide high-quality opportunities for sport and recreation, fully in accordance with Paragraph 73 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and would allow the implementation of one of the top priorities in the two Councils' Playing Pitches Strategy. I recommend that it be approved.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details of the following matters shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.
 - i) contractors access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel,
 - ii) contractors site storage area/compound,
 - iii) the means of moving, storing and stacking all building materials, plant and equipment around and adjacent to the site,
 - iv) the arrangements for parking of contractors vehicles and contractors personnel vehicles.

Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

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

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

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

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

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

7. Before the development/use hereby permitted is occupied, a scheme for the insulation of the plant in order to minimise the level of noise emanating from the said plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented before the use hereby permitted is commenced.

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

8. The artificial grass pitches hereby approved as Pitches 2 and 3 shall be constructed and then maintained and retained thereafter fully in accordance with the submitted Acoustic Consultants Ltd 'Proposed Artificial Grass Pitches for Hockey, University Sports Ground, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge - Environmental Noise Report (Reference: 6533/DO/pw - February 2017' and in particular the noise mitigation measures detailed within.

Reason: To protect the health and amenity of neighbouring residents. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13)

9. Before first use of the artificial grass pitches hereby permitted an Operational Noise Management and Monitoring Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority for approval. This shall include details of site wide measures to be undertaken and implemented to mitigate and reduce noisy activities and anti-social behaviour as far as is reasonably practicable. A written complaints procedure / action plan shall also be implemented. The approved plan shall be implemented in full and adhered to at all times.

Reason: To protect the health and amenity of neighbouring residents. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13)

10. Public announcement systems and similar loudspeaker amplification equipment shall not be used in connection with any activities on the pitches hereby approved.

Reason: To protect the health and amenity of neighbouring residents. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13)

11. Artificial grass pitch 3 shall not be used when a competitive athletics meet is held on the neighbouring University Sports and Athletics Track.

Reason: To protect the health and amenity of neighbouring residents. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13)

12. The artificial grass pitch hereby approved as Pitch 2 shall not be used on any day outside the hours 0900-2130.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbours. (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4 and 4/13)

13. The artificial grass pitch hereby approved as Pitch 3 shall not be used outside the following hours.

- 0900 to 2130 hrs - Mondays to Fridays
- 0900 to 1900hrs - Saturdays and Sundays
- 0900 to 1830hrs - Bank and other Public Holidays

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbours. (Cambridge Local Plan policies 3/4 and 4/13)

14. The pitch hereby approved as Pitch 2 shall not be used for playing or practising football or rugby. The pitch hereby approved as Pitch 3 shall not be used until a list of permitted sporting activities has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Use thereafter shall be only in accordance with the approved list.

Reason: To protect the health and amenity of neighbouring residents. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13)

15. The artificial floodlighting to artificial grass pitches 2 and 3 hereby approved shall be constructed / installed and then maintained and retained thereafter fully in accordance with the submitted Midlands Lighting Solution Ltd 'University Hockey Pitches, Cambridge - Obtrusive Light Report dated 20th March 2017'.

Reason: To ensure light pollution is minimised. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/15)

16. The floodlighting hereby approved shall only be operated during the following hours:

- 1200 to 1830hrs on any six days in any week
- 1830 to 1900 hrs on Wednesdays and Saturdays
- 1830 to 2130hrs on any five evenings other than Sundays in any one week

At all times the floodlighting scheme shall incorporate automated time control to automatically accord with these times.

Reason: To minimise light pollution and to avoid harm to the residential amenity of neighbours. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 4/15)

17. No part of the source of floodlighting shall be directly visible to users of the adjacent public highway.

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

18. Prior to commencement and before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site in connection with the works hereby approved, a phased Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP), in accordance with BS5837 2012, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. In a logical sequence the AMS and TPP will consider all phases of construction in relation to the potential impact on trees and detail the specification and position of protection barriers and ground protection and all measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, including demolition, foundation design, storage of materials, ground works, installation of services, erection of scaffolding and landscaping.

The approved AMS and TPP will be implemented throughout the development and the agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made in them, without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the welfare of trees of amenity value. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4)

19. No work on site, including excavation and the bringing of pipes on to the site, shall be commenced until a Safeguarding Plan for Protected Species has been submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Works shall then proceed only in accordance with the agreed safeguarding plan.

Reason: To safeguard protected species. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/7)

20. No development shall commence until details of soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Soft landscape works shall include 1:500 scale planting plans; schedule of plants, percentage breakdown of the species mix, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities. All soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendation of the appropriate British Standard or other recognised code of good practice. The works shall be carried out in the first planting season following completion of associated construction works. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Those aspects of the landscape works which provide mitigation for the loss of habitats on site shall be so identified in the submitted details, and those aspects shall not be removed thereafter unless alternative mitigation has previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and implemented.

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

21. The ball-stop fences hereby approved shall be coloured RAL 6009 Fir Green.

Reason: To ensure development is well-integrated with the immediate locality. (Cambridge Local Plan 3/4)

22. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until detailed surface water drainage works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted, an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles set out in The National Planning Policy Framework and associated Guidance, and the results of the assessment provided to the local planning authority. The system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall:
- a. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; and
 - b. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed details and management and maintenance plan.

Reason: To avoid the risk of flooding (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/16).

23. The pitches hereby approved shall not be brought into use until a revised scheme for cycle parking has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to first use and shall be maintained in the same form thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate cycle parking. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

24. Works to extend the pavilion shall be carried out in materials which match as closely as possible those of the existing building.

Reason: To ensure the extension is integrated into the existing building and the immediate locality (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4 and 3/14)

25. The electricity substation hereby approved shall not be erected until drawings clarifying the roof form to be employed have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The substation shall thereafter be constructed only in accordance with the approved drawings.

Reason: To ensure the substation is well-integrated with the immediate locality. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 3/4)

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

* The statement of significance and research objectives;

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

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

Developers will wish to ensure that in drawing up their development programme, the timetable for the investigation is included within the details of the agreed scheme.

Reason: To ensure archaeological remains are properly investigated, recorded and preserved. (Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/9)

INFORMATIVE: To satisfy the plant sound insulation condition, the rating level (in accordance with BS4142:2014) from all plant, equipment and vents etc (collectively) associated with this application should be less than or equal to the existing background level (L90) at the boundary of the premises subject to this application and having regard to noise sensitive premises.

Tonal/impulsive sound frequencies should be eliminated or at least considered in any assessment and should carry an additional correction in accordance with BS4142:2014. This is to prevent unreasonable disturbance to other premises. This requirement applies both during the day (0700 to 2300 hrs over any one hour period) and night time (2300 to 0700 hrs over any one 15 minute period).

It is recommended that the agent/applicant submits an acoustic prediction survey/report in accordance with the principles of BS4142:2014 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" or similar, concerning the effects on amenity rather than likelihood for complaints. Noise levels shall be predicted at the boundary having regard to neighbouring premises.

It is important to note that a full BS4142:2014 assessment is not required, only certain aspects to be incorporated into an acoustic assessment as described within this informative.

Such a survey / report should include: a large scale plan of the site in relation to neighbouring premises; sound sources and measurement / prediction points marked on plan; a list of sound sources; details of proposed sound sources / type of plant such as: number, location, sound power levels, sound frequency spectrums, sound directionality of plant, sound levels from duct intake or discharge points; details of sound mitigation measures (attenuation details of any intended enclosures, silencers or barriers); description of full sound calculation procedures; sound levels at a representative sample of noise sensitive locations and hours of operation.

Any report shall include raw measurement data so that conclusions may be thoroughly evaluated and calculations checked.

INFORMATIVE: Dust condition informative

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

-Council's Supplementary Planning Document - "Sustainable Design and Construction 2007":
<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/sustainable-design-and-construction-spd.pdf>

-Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction
http://iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/iaqm_guidance_report_draft1.4.pdf

- Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites 2012
http://www.iaqm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/guidance/monitoring_construction_sites_2012.pdf

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

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

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that to be acceptable, the noise management plan required by Condition 9 will need to provide that Pitch 3 shall not be used unless Pitches 1 and 2 are in use simultaneously, and that if Pitch 3 is to be used in part only, that use shall take place at the south end of the pitch, not the north end.