

**Application Number** 18/1116/FUL **Agenda Item**

**Date Received** 13th July 2018 **Officer** Tony Collins

**Target Date** 7th September 2018

**Ward** Queen Ediths

**Site** Land To The North Of Harrison Drive And West Of The Donald Macintyre Building, Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8PH

**Proposal** Erection of a new children's day nursery on the existing Faculty of Education car park, with associated outdoor playspace, alterations to the car park, provision of new bicycle and buggy parking, landscaping and ancillary works.

**Applicant** Chancellor, Masters and Scholars

<p>SUMMARY</p>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>It will improve the range, quality and accessibility of education facilities.</p> <p>It will not have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential or non-residential occupiers through noise.</p> <p>It will not have an adverse impact on the highway network.</p> <p>It will manage surface water satisfactorily, and not pose an unacceptable risk of flooding.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>APPROVAL</p>

**1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

1.1 The application site, which is at present almost entirely covered by a paved car parking area, lies alongside Harrison Drive

(which is not an adopted public highway). It is to the west of the University Faculty of Education building, to the north of the main Homerton College buildings, and to the east of the Hills Road Sports and Tennis Centre. Immediately to the north of the application site are detached houses in Corfe Close.

- 1.2 Trumpington House, which stands 38m east of the site, is listed Grade II. The Ibberson Building, part of the main Homerton College range, lies 38m to the south-west of the site. It is also listed Grade II, but is partly screened from the application site by adjoining buildings. There are no other locally or statutorily listed buildings in the vicinity. The site is not within a conservation area.
- 1.3 An Area Tree Preservation Order (24/2018) covers the entire site. Another TPO (01/2000) protects two sycamores and a maple which lie just beyond the western boundary of the site. The tennis courts immediately to the west of the site, and the landscaped area to the east, surrounding Trumpington House and the Faculty of Education building, are both defined as Protected Open Space in the local plan, but the application site, lying between these two areas, is not a Protected Open Space. The site falls outside the controlled parking zone.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The proposed nursery would be a single-storey building, oriented along a north-south axis and located in the north-west part of the site, with outdoor play space on the east side and the approach drive, car and cycle parking spaces to the south. It would accommodate 100 children, and have a staff of 40.
- 2.2 The building would measure 41m north to south, and 18m from east to west at its widest point. The majority of this footprint would be occupied by four large nursery rooms on the east side, with full-height glazing and French doors opening on to the outdoor play area. This section of the building (34m x 10m) would be covered by a monopitch roof, sloping up from eaves at 2.5m on the east to a peak at 5.8m on the west. The remainder of the building, which would accommodate the stores, plant room, toilets, kitchen and lockers down the west side, and the offices, staff room and reception area the south end, would have a flat roof at 3m above ground, surrounded by a 400mm parapet. The main roof would be of standing-seam zinc. The

nursery would be clad in a mix of horizontal and vertical timber cladding, with metal joinery.

2.3 The outdoor play area would be surfaced in rubber. It would have an acoustic fence down the east side (facing Trumpington House), clad on the east face with climbing plants. The acoustic fence would continue along the north boundary to a point 3m west of the north-east corner of the building. The existing boundary wall between the site and Nos. 3 and 4 Corfe Close would be retained; the acoustic fence would run along the south (nursery) side of this wall.

2.4 The area to the south of the building would be surfaced with permeable paving, and would contain two cycle shelters, accommodating 100 cycles. 16 car parking spaces would be provided in this area, including two disabled spaces. Four parking hoops for non-standard cycles (such as cargo bikes) are also proposed. The areas around the car parking area would be landscaped, and two additional trees are proposed at the north end of the site to increase the extent to which the building would be screened in views from 3 Corfe Close.

2.5 The original application was accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Transport assessment
3. Travel Plan
4. Flood Risk Strategy
5. Acoustic Report
6. Archaeology report
7. Ecology report
8. Tree survey

2.6 Following comments from consultees, the following additional information has been submitted:

On 04.09.2018:

9. Technical Note covering playspace standards, mechanical and electrical plant, conservation, odour, cycle storage and drainage.

On 01.10.2018:

- 10. Noise impact report
- 11. Surface water strategy

2.7 An updated version of the noise impact report was submitted on 16.10.2018, and a further revision on 30.10.2018.

**3.0 SITE HISTORY:** None relevant

#### **4.0 PUBLICITY**

4.1 Advertisement:	No
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

#### **5.0 POLICY**

##### **5.1 Central Government Advice**

National Planning Policy Framework 2018  
Planning Practice Guidance 2014  
Noise Policy Statement for England 2010  
Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions  
(Annex A)

##### **5.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2018**

- Policy 1: The presumption in favour of sustainable development
- Policy 28: Carbon reduction, community energy networks, sustainable design and construction, and water use
- Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle
- Policy 32: Flood risk
- Policy 34: Light pollution control
- Policy 35: Protection of human health from noise and vibration
- Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust
- Policy 43: University development
- Policy 55: Responding to context
- Policy 56: Creating successful places
- Policy 57: Designing new buildings

- Policy 59: Designing landscape and the public realm
- Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment
- Policy 62: Local heritage assets
- Policy 70: Protection of priority species and habitats
- Policy 71: Trees
- Policy 74: Education facilities
- Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development
- Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development
- Policy 82: Parking management

### 5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents

Cambridge City Council (May 2007) – Sustainable Design and Construction:

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

**Cambridgeshire County Council (Transport Assessment Team)**

### Walking and Cycling Routes and Facilities

- 6.1 Site considered to be within an accessible distance to local public transport links including Cambridge Railway Station. Walking and cycling facilities including wide footways and cycle lanes are provided on Hills Road and therefore are likely to be used by staff and parents carrying pupils of nursery age.

### Public Transport

- 6.2 Approximately 13 bus services stop in the vicinity of the proposed site which makes the site well connected and accessible. Cambridge Railway Station is approximately 1.5km from the proposed site which provides a viable option for staff to use who live outside of the City.

### Local Roads and Parking

- 6.3 The highway authority: agrees with the use of ATCs, Classified Turning Counts, and Queue surveys on Harrison Drive as the only site access drive, accepts that Harrison Drive/Hills Road junction is currently operating well within capacity, and accepts

the accident data set provided and concludes that the study area in question does not show an accident cluster.

#### Forecast Trip Generation and Distribution

- 6.4 The 'first principles' approach has been used and is accepted as the applicant has derived likely enrolment profile from another existing nursery in Cambridge. Highway authority accepts the proposed trip generation in Table 5.3 and considers this a robust assessment. TRICS analysis provided in Table 5.8 and Appendix H(i)a accepted.

#### Transport Impact

- 6.5 Junction capacity analysis accepted. Agreed that the development will not have a detrimental impact on the local highway network. The assessment concludes that there will be some spare capacity in the 2025 Do Something scenario. Travel Planning measures should focus on reducing single occupancy vehicle usage to ensure that the junction stays within capacity.
- 6.6 Highway authority notes that that the Assessment shows a parking supply deficit between approximately 10:00 and 15:00 but parking levels will remain within local standards. CCC support the encouragement of sustainable modes. In any case, parking levels need to be monitored as part of the Travel Plan measures.

#### Mitigation

- 6.7 Due to the location of the car park, individuals may want to park there to avoid paying for other car parks. It is strongly advised that a Car Parking Management Plan is implemented to ensure that those parking on site are users of the Nursery. They may come in the form of a permit system or in the form of a Travel Plan measure for example.

#### Travel Plan

- 6.8 Required.

## Conclusions

- 6.9 No objection to this application. Travel Plan required. Parking Management Plan urged.

## **Environmental Health**

### Original comments (07.08.2018)

#### Noise

- 6.10 Noise impact assessment not submitted. Further information required to address concerns about impulsive event noise, proximity of play area to Corfe Close, impact on neighbouring buildings at first floor level, use of open windows for ventilation, and plant noise.

#### Odour

- 6.11 Insufficient information.

#### Contaminated Land

- 6.12 Due to the brownfield nature of the site, and the sensitivity of the proposed end use, the risks from potentially contaminated land will need to be assessed by the applicant. The standard suite of contaminated land conditions will need to be applied to this permission.

#### Air Quality

- 6.13 Although the proposed development will lead to a small increase in vehicle movements at peak times (as shown in the Transport Assessment), taking into account the overall net decrease in car parking spaces, I have no objections on air quality grounds.
- 6.14 We would, however, welcome the installation of two slow electric vehicle (EV) charge points, to future-proof the development as demand for EV charge points continue to increase and to encourage the uptake of low emission vehicles, in line with paragraph 35 of the Framework.

6.15 Conditions recommended to control:

- Construction hours
- Construction deliveries
- Piling
- Contaminated land

Further conditions may be required

Second comments (11.10.2018, following submission of a noise impact assessment)

6.16 Noise impact assessment submitted, but issues of play area layout, neighbouring first-floor rooms, and plant noise not yet addressed.

Third comments (16.10.2018)

6.17 These comments address the specific issues raised by the residents of Corfe Close about the noise impact assessment.

6.18 Residents suggest that the noise impact assessment (NIA) fails to consider noise from activities in the external playground area of the proposed nursery. In fact, Table 5 of the assessment identifies the impact from the external playground area; it is correctly labelled in the title but incorrectly labelled within the table itself. The noise levels, however, are correct

6.19 Residents suggest that since the NIA states that at the Edwinstowe Close Nursery the noise from the external playground area is within the range 59-85, then the noise from the external play area impacting on N<sup>os</sup>. 3 and 4 Corfe Close would be much higher than the 49-77 existing background level stated in the Report. This is not the case; the figures of 59 (LA<sub>eq</sub>) - 85 (LA<sub>max</sub>) cannot be treated as a comparable range as the LA<sub>eq</sub> and LA<sub>max</sub> are two different measurement parameters.

6.20 Residents suggest that the comparison of Edwinstowe Close Nursery with the proposed nursery fails to take into account their different sizes. They assert that because the former has only 79 children, whereas the proposed Harrison Drive Nursery will have 100, the latter will consequently have a noise impact at least 25% greater than the EC Nursery, which would be very

significant.

- 6.21 The 21 additional children are in practice unlikely to have a significant noise impact due to the likely low levels of additional children outside at any one time. Even if all children were outside at once, then an additional 21 children would still not have a significant impact. The doubling of energy of a continuous noise source, e.g. increasing from 50 children to 100 (if each individual child generated the same noise level), would only result in an increase of 3 dB which would not be significant.

Fourth comments (12.05.2018, following additional submissions from the applicant)

- 6.22 Previous comments regarding construction impacts, contaminated land and air quality remain relevant.

#### Noise

- 6.23 The applicant's email confirms the hours of use for the site will be 08:00hrs to 18:00hrs Monday to Friday. This is reasonable and should be conditioned.

- 6.24 The submitted email from Michael Osbourn and the BDP revised (P02) "noise impact assessment" dated 18<sup>th</sup> October 2018 have addressed my outstanding queries. I recommend a compliance condition to ensure the plant and acoustic mitigation installed complies with the recommendations and the stated sound levels calculated within the BDP report. It is also recommended that a further condition requires submission of details of the play area and equipment prior to installation to ensure the equipment is suitable with regards to noise impact and is located in a suitable position away from the residential shared boundary.

#### Odour

- 6.25 Odour from the cooking process at the application site has the potential to adversely affect amenity. Condition required.

6.26 Additional conditions recommended to control:

- Hours of use
- Compliance with the acoustic assessment
- Fume extraction and filtration
- Design and location of play equipment

### **Urban Design and Conservation team**

#### Initial comments (02.08.18)

6.27 The design of the building and the materials are acceptable. The proposed site plan would reduce the impact of the built form on the setting of the listed building.

6.28 However, the application does not give enough detail about the boundary that will be installed between the grounds of the listed building and the nursery. Despite having new development on the site, Trumpington House has retained an open character to its immediate landscape with no obvious boundaries other than trees or shrubs used for that purpose. This open character to the grounds is important as it gives a large 'breathing space' to the listed building. The plans as proposed show a fence line between the play area and the grounds of Trumpington House, but there is not enough information for a full assessment of the impact on the setting to be made.

#### Second comments (11.09.2018)

6.29 The applicant has supplied the additional information requested regarding the boundary between the nursery and Trumpington House. The information submitted is acceptable in terms of its impact on the setting of the listed building.

### **Nature Conservation Officer**

6.30 Content with submitted Ecology report. Recommend a condition to secure bird and bat boxes.

## **Drainage Officer**

### Initial comments (02.08.2018)

- 6.31 The submitted Flood Risk Assessment mentions the existence of shallow groundwater. The groundwater level should be identified to assess the suitability of permeable paving infiltration as the preferred option.
- 6.32 Should the infiltration be unfeasible, the proposed alternative solution is a connection to an existing drainage system in Homerton College's ownership who have a reluctance due to capacity concerns. It is understood that an assessment of this existing network is being undertaken and the findings need to be submitted. Without this information it has not been demonstrated how the proposed development can be sustainably drained.
- 6.33 The hydraulic calculations submitted only include 30% allowance for climate change which should be 40% in accordance with the latest Environment Agency guidance.
- 6.34 Not possible to give a full assessment.

### Second comments (24.09.2018) – following additional drainage information.

- 6.35 It has not been demonstrated that a minimum of 1m between the invert level of the proposed soakaway and the groundwater level is achievable. The submitted recorded groundwater levels show that the highest recorded level would be less than 300mm below the invert level of the proposed permeable paving.
- 6.36 For the proposed alternative solution, the submitted Technical File Note identifies mitigation measures that should be undertaken in third party land. It is unclear who would be responsible for installing and maintaining these mitigation measures. Furthermore, the applicant will need to demonstrate the proposed development will have the right to discharge into this system for the lifetime of the development and to construct/maintain the mitigation measures in third party land, through the provision of a legal agreement.

6.37 Hydraulic calculations to prove that the receiving network can manage the proposed development should also be provided.

6.38 Recommend refusal.

Third comments (05.10.2018) – following further drainage submission

6.39 The submitted recorded groundwater levels show that the highest recorded level would be less than 300mm below the invert level of the proposed permeable paving. Even if this is an improvement on the current drainage condition, it represents a risk of contamination of groundwater and a risk of inundation of the system which is unacceptable.

6.40 For the proposed alternative solution, the submitted Technical File Note identifies mitigation measures that should be undertaken in third party land. It is unclear who would be responsible for installing and maintaining these mitigation measures. The applicant needs to provide a written acceptance from the landlord to demonstrate their (the applicant's) right to construct and maintain the mitigation measures as well as their right to discharge into this system for the lifetime of the development. Provision of a legal agreement can be conditioned once the written acceptance is submitted.

6.41 Hydraulic calculations proving that the receiving network can cope with the proposed development have still not been submitted.

6.42 Recommend refusal.

### **Streets and Open Spaces (Landscape officer)**

6.43 Concerns expressed about cycle parking provision (both two-tier design and space for cargo bikes) and the absence of any naturally-surfaced areas within the play space. Conditions sought on cycle parking, landscape details and landscape maintenance

### **Streets and Open Spaces (Arboricultural Officer)**

6.44 No arboricultural objections to the proposal subject to conditions to ensure the submission of an acceptable tree

protection plan (TPP) and arboricultural method statement (AMS), a pre-commencement meeting on site with the arboricultural officer, and adherence to the agreed TPP and AMS.

### **Cycling officer**

6.45 Requires specific low hoop or ground-ring provision and markings for cargo bikes. Broxap two-tier racks are unsuitable; alternative required.

### **Shared Waste Service**

6.46 Children's nurseries typically produce more waste than is expected, especially if there is a kitchen providing meals/hot food. It is recommended that the bin store be large enough to easily accommodate a number of 1100 litre bins, and should be:

- lockable
- well lit
- fitted with doors which stand/lock open to ease access/egress
- ventilated
- suitably drained and close to a tap for cleansing
- free from raised kerbs outside, for ease of moving bins to vehicle
- accessed by sufficiently wide paths

6.47 Something to prevent vehicles parking where the refuse collection vehicle needs to stop is required. Capacity and frequency of collection can be sorted out by the Nursery on completion.

### **Fire and Rescue**

6.48 Condition requested to secure fire hydrants.

### **Disability Access Panel (meeting of 31.07.2018)**

6.49 Design should consider access provision for all potential users of this site including visitors and should provide: front door automation to ensure access for all into the building, a dual height reception desk, an induction hearing loop system, level thresholds at rear doors, colour contrasts to assist the partially sighted on all internal doors, an outward-opening or sliding door

to the accessible WC, and door widths and configurations to enable wheelchair users to be able to travel easily through the building.

- 6.50 As this is not a University building it will not be linked to their 24/7 alarm system, so measures will need to be specified in the event of an emergency.
- 6.51 Panel would also encourage sufficient space for storage of pushchairs/buggies within the lobby, as these can cause an obstruction.
- 6.52 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 County Councillor Taylor has commented on this application.
- 7.2 Her comment is as follows: 'Reducing parking spaces at the Faculty of Education will cause displacement. Cars cannot park in the residential streets on the opposite side of Hills Road as they are covered by a residents' parking scheme. Any extra parking in other streets would cause nuisance to residents.'
- 7.3 This application is before Committee because the delegation scheme does not give officers delegated powers to determine an application for change of use about which there are objections from third parties. However, Councillor McGerty has also requested that the application be brought before Committee.
- 7.4 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses made representations on the original submission:

Within Cambridge:  
255 Cherry Hinton Road  
3 Corfe Close  
23 Gladeside  
57 Great Eastern Street  
2 Harrison Drive  
3 Harrison Drive

170 Hills Road  
Trumpington House, 184 Hills Road (5 responses)  
301 Hills Road  
7 Marshall Road  
23 Scholars Court  
24 Scholars Court  
37 Scholars Court  
39 Scholars Court  
43 Scholars Court  
44 Scholars Court  
76 Scholars Court  
82 Scholars Court  
84 Scholars Court  
86 Scholars Court  
87 Scholars Court  
149 Vinery Road

Outside Cambridge:

4 John Beckett Court, Chapel Street, Ely  
Home Farm, 25 High Ditch Road, Fen Ditton  
38 School Lane, Fulbourn  
Kings Cottage, Brandon Road, Wordwell, Bury St Edmunds

Representations have also been received from Camcycle

7.5 The representations can be summarised as follows:

### **Principle of development**

- Should be on the Addenbrooke's site
- Should not be limited to use by University employees, but be open at least to Harrison Drive residents
- Erosion of open space and tree cover
- Inappropriate to put nursery in car park

### **Design in context**

- Insufficient outdoor space
- Barely meets minimum standards for nurseries
- Standard of nursery provision would harm reputation of Faculty of Education
- No consultation with children about nursery design
- Site is too noisy for children (aircraft noise)

- Cladding may deteriorate

### **Neighbour amenity**

- Needs conditions to mitigate noise impact on houses in Corfe Close (double thickness acoustic fence, acoustic fence extended to NE and NW, extended wall in NE corner)
- Disruption to students and researchers at Faculty of Education
- Increased traffic noise on Harrison Drive
- Needs conditions on construction work

### **Highway safety**

- Hazard to safety of cyclists and pedestrians during construction
- There are existing safety issues at junction of Hills Road and Harrison Drive which would be exacerbated by more journeys at peak times
- Transport Assessment (TA) wrong with respect to visibility at Hills Road junction
- TA wrong with respect to pedestrian priority at Hills Road junction
- Hazard to vulnerable road users from drop-off traffic
- Parents on nursery run likely to exhibit particularly risky/antisocial driving behaviour
- Harrison Drive too narrow; reduction in motor traffic needed to improve safety for cyclists Painted zebra crossing at car park entrance should be raised
- TA wrong to suggest cyclists could share narrow Harrison Drive footway with pedestrians

### **Parking and deliveries management**

- Insufficient car parking and drop-off space for nursery users – unrealistic to believe parents will use non-car modes
- Parking space for visitors and services in Harrison Drive is already inadequate
- Will exacerbate existing parking on yellow lines in Harrison Drive, inconveniencing residents and endangering cyclists
- Parents will park in Scholars Court disabled bay

- Vehicles will be forced to turn round in Scholars Court entrance, causing inconvenience to residents, damage, and air pollution
- Concern that car parking restrictions in Harrison Drive cannot be enforced
- Will exacerbate pressure on on-street car parking nearby, already worsened by extension of the CPZ
- Conflict between deliveries to / waste collection from Faculty of Education / Homerton College and nursery parents drop-off and pick-up
- Existing delivery vehicle activity connected with the College causes early morning disruption to Scholars Court residents and damage to footways. This is to be compounded by the use of larger delivery vehicles in the near future, and would be exacerbated by the addition of hundreds more car movements
- Reduced car parking for Faculty of Education
- Loss of disabled parking space at the Faculty of Education
- No separation between car park and area where toddlers may be running about
- Inadequate car parking for nursery staff
- Lack of cycle parking on the site is already an issue
- Only four additional cycle hoops are to be provided
- Insufficient parking spaces for cargo bikes
- Parking space for cycle trailers required
- Two-tier cycle parking is inferior, especially when many users may have child seats attached
- Main cycle parking area is on wrong side of car park
- Cycle shelter not protected from vehicles by bollards

### **Transport issues**

- Traffic on Hills Road is already very heavy; increased traffic flow will have a detrimental impact
- Increased traffic could cause gridlock
- Transport assessment (TA) does not take account of expected future developments at Homerton
- Poor bus connectivity to the site
- Enrolment profile in TA inaccurate
- TA wrong to suggest nursery staff will show same modal pattern as Faculty of Education staff; former are more poorly paid, and therefore more likely to live further away and be forced to use cars

- TA wrong on modal shares of car and cycle travel to West Cambridge nursery

## **Drainage**

- Pressure on surface water network
- Existing issues with surface water overloading the foul sewer and causing serious odour problems

7.6 Following the submission of additional material by the applicant on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2018, further representations objecting to the application were submitted from the following addresses:

3 Corfe Close  
4 Corfe Close  
87 Scholars Court

and from a committee at the Faculty of Education set up to respond to this application.

7.7 The additional representations from Corfe Close residents express concerns about key aspects of the applicants' noise survey and question its findings.

7.8 The representation from the Faculty of Education Committee reiterates the concerns expressed in earlier representations about:

- Disruption to students and researchers at Faculty of Education
- Increased traffic noise on Harrison Drive
- Pressure on surface water network (highlighted by flooding which has already occurred in the Faculty)
- Infiltration surveys may have avoided existing non-permeable footings on the site
- Standard of nursery provision would harm reputation of Faculty of Education

7.9 It also raises the following additional issues.

- Noise impact on administrative offices at the Faculty of Education
- Noise disruption caused by installation of new drainage system

- Potential overloading of the pumping station for foul sewage
- Nursery car park may obstruct access to sewage pumping station for servicing
- Submitted traffic survey took place during period of abnormally low use

7.10 The additional representation from Scholars' Court reiterates the concerns about traffic car parking and the manoeuvring of service vehicles set out in earlier representations. It also raises the following additional issue.

- Proposed enlargement of the balancing pond on Harrison Drive would reduce amenity value, increase risk to children playing, and detract from the sculpture

7.11 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**

### **Principle of Development**

- 8.1 In my view, the proposed nursery would improve the scale, range, quality and accessibility of education facilities and would be located in the area it would serve. I accept that many of the parents using this nursery may work on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, but I do not consider that this location is so far away as to be inappropriate for that purpose; the two sites are very easily accessible from each other by bus and cycle, and I do not consider it to be the case that such users will inevitably make the journey between them by private car.
- 8.2 The area to be developed is currently occupied mainly by hard-surfaced car parking space, and is not protected open space. I do not consider there will be any significant erosion of openness or green space or loss of trees.
- 8.3 The restriction of places at the nursery to those employed by the applicant (the University) does not appear to me to be unreasonable, nor does it cause any conflict with policy. The quality of provision at the facility will depend on factors such as staffing, training, operational policies and monitoring, which are

not affected by this application. Quality will also be the subject of other regulatory regimes including OFSTED; it is not appropriate for the assessment of a planning application to consider these issues, or the impact those standards will have on the reputation of the University department nearby.

- 8.4 In my opinion, the principle of the establishment of a new 100-place nursery on this site is acceptable, and in accordance with policies 1, 55, 56, 57, 67, 70, 71 and 74 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

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

- 8.5 In my view, the scale and massing of this building are appropriate for the location. It would be a modest building compared to others nearby, and the roof profile and extensive use of timber boarding would give it distinctiveness while at the same time allowing it to sit comfortably in this relatively open area alongside trees. The quality and appropriateness of the individual cladding materials can be ensured through the discharge of conditions process. Timber boarding has been successful as a cladding material on other buildings in the city, and I do not consider it likely that the quality of the proposed building would be undermined by the deterioration of the cladding.
- 8.6 The building is configured in an appropriate manner for its function, with playrooms offering access to the external space and also shaded from direct afternoon sun, a legible approach and entrance, and functional areas including plant and bin storage arranged in the 'hidden' zone between the building and the western boundary.
- 8.7 As far as internal space standards are concerned, Government policy set out in *Statutory Framework for the Early Years Foundation Stage, Setting the Standards for Learning, Development and Care for Children from Birth to Five (March 2017)* requires 3.5 m<sup>2</sup> per child for those under 2 years old, 2.5 m<sup>2</sup> per child for two-year-olds and 2.3m<sup>2</sup> per child for those aged 3-5. The area for babies in the proposed nursery provides 3.7 m<sup>2</sup> per child, and the three other spaces provide 3.4 m<sup>2</sup>, 3.4 m<sup>2</sup> and 3.8 m<sup>2</sup> per child. Representations suggest that the proposal barely meets minimum standards for nurseries, but in

terms of internal space, these figures lie comfortably above the Government minimum levels.

8.8 The above document requires that access to external play space be provided, but does not specify any area guidelines. A further document, Department for Education and Skills: *Building for Sure Start: a design guide Integrated provision for under-fives* recommends 'external space large enough to accommodate the needs of all the children using the space at any one time and to minimise the likelihood of collision accidents resulting from overcrowding'. It provides an approximate guideline of 9m<sup>2</sup> per child. The external space available in this proposal is 385m<sup>2</sup>, which would provide the 9m<sup>2</sup> guideline allowance for 42 children. The applicants state that the 25% of children under 1 will generally not be outside, and the 1-2 yr old group only at limited times with close supervision. I acknowledge that this outdoor space provision is more limited than is ideal, but I do not consider that the shortfall is so serious that it conflicts with the objectives of creating successful places and high-quality buildings in policies 56 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

8.9 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57 and 59.

### **Impact on the listed building**

8.10 The conservation officer is satisfied that the proposal will not have a harmful impact on the setting of Trumpington House. I concur with this view.

8.11 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 61.

### **Amenity of residential and non-residential neighbours**

#### Sunlight, privacy and visual impact

8.12 The proposed building would not give rise to any opportunities for overlooking. The building would stand 11m to the south of the house at 3 Corfe Close, which has a relatively modest garden space between the house and the common boundary with the application site. This would result in some overshadowing of the garden in the winter months, but in my

view the impact would be limited, given the height of the existing boundary wall, and the impact of existing planting. I have viewed the site from the rear garden at 3 Corfe Close. I note that the proposed building would be clearly visible from this garden. It would be partly screened by an existing tree, and would be further screened by the two proposed new trees, but it would not be completely hidden. However, I do not consider the building to be close enough or high enough to have an overbearing impact or to create an unacceptable sense of enclosure.

- 8.13 I do not consider that the proposal would cause significant harm to the residential amenity of the occupiers of Nos. 4 and 5 Corfe Close in terms of daylight, sunlight, privacy or outlook, and in these respects, I consider the proposal to be in accordance with policies 55 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. The building is not close enough to any other residential premises to cause harm in any of these ways.

### Noise

- 8.14 A detailed noise impact assessment has been submitted, and further information requested by the environmental health team has also been provided to supplement the initial assessment. Predicted noise levels in the assessment are based on survey data from the Edwinstowe Close nursery on 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> September 2018. The environmental health team are satisfied with the validity of this survey data as a basis for prediction, and I concur with their view. I agree with the environmental health officer (paras 6.17-6.21) that the concerns expressed by residents about the updated noise impact assessment are not well-founded and do not diminish its validity.
- 8.15 The noise impact assessment considers in detail the likely impact of internal (playroom) noise and external (play area) noise on the two receptor locations closest to the proposed nursery, namely first-floor windows of habitable rooms on the south side of Nos. 3 and 4 Corfe Close. For the purposes of this prediction, the existing vegetation along the common boundary between these two houses and the proposed nursery site (which is significant) is ignored, in order to present a worst-case scenario.

8.16 The assessment gives predicted levels for both  $LA_{max}$  (a maximum level over a very short duration), and  $LA_{eq}$  (the equivalent continuous noise level of a sound, over a given time period, as an average). It assesses these levels against the three categories of noise level given in the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE):

- No Observed Effect (NOEL)
- Lowest Observed Adverse Effect (LOAEL), and
- Significant Observed Adverse Effect (SOAEL).

8.17 The assessment shows that as far as internal (playroom) noise is concerned both the  $LA_{eq}$  and the  $LA_{max}$  levels of noise would remain within the NOEL category of the NPSE for both 3 and 4 Corfe Close, and would therefore be unlikely to cause annoyance. The same applies as far as external (play area) noise is concerned when the nursery day as a whole (0800-1800) is considered. When levels are taken for the Loudest Measured Hour the predicted  $LA_{max}$  at both houses would fall into the LOAEL category, as would the predicted  $LA_{eq}$  at 3 Corfe Close, but these levels are judged unlikely to cause annoyance, because they are still lower than the typical background levels in the area.

8.18 The environmental health officer is satisfied, in the light of this detailed analysis, that the expected levels of noise from the playrooms and playground would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, and I concur with this view. He does not accept the view expressed in neighbour representations that additional noise screening measures above and beyond those set out in the application area required, but he does recommend a condition to control the layout of the external play area. I concur with his advice on all these issues.

8.19 All other receptors, including other houses in Corfe Close, and rooms in the Faculty of Education, are much more distant from the proposed nursery site than the two houses considered in the submitted noise impact assessment, and I do not consider there is likely to be any adverse noise impact from nursery activities in any of those locations. Similarly, I do not consider that vehicle movements associated with pick-up and drop-off at the proposed nursery are likely to have any significant noise

impact at any of these locations. The environmental health officer has raised no concerns about this issue.

- 8.20 The environmental health officer is satisfied that any noise impact associated with the plant proposed at the site can be controlled by condition. I concur with this view and recommend the condition he has suggested.
- 8.21 I acknowledge that construction can be disruptive to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, and I recommend conditions to control the hours of construction, the times of delivery and collection during construction, piling, and the mitigation of dust.
- 8.22 The environmental health team's advice is that the issue of cooking odours from the on-site kitchen can be addressed by condition. I concur, and recommend such a condition.
- 8.23 In my opinion, subject to conditions, the proposal adequately respects the amenity of its residential and non-residential neighbours with respect to noise, vibration, odours and dust, and I consider that in these respects, it is compliant with policies 1, 35, 36, 55 and 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018), paragraphs 170 and 180 of the Framework, and the Noise Policy Statement for England 2010.

### **Highway Safety**

- 8.24 The highway authority has confirmed that, notwithstanding objectors' comments, there is no accident cluster at the junction of Hills Road and Harrison Drive. The authority has raised no concerns about highway safety, nor has it criticised nor questioned the accuracy of, the applicants' transport assessment. I do not consider that the threat to cyclists and pedestrians from cars dropping off at the nursery is any greater than that posed by vehicles entering the car park at present.
- 8.25 I agree with respondents that construction vehicles may create a hazard on Harrison Drive. In my view this can be addressed by a condition requiring a traffic management plan for the construction phase, which will need to cover measures to ensure safety during collections and deliveries, such as a banksman. Since this condition is a 'pre-commencement condition', it has been agreed with the applicant prior to this

meeting, in accordance with Section 100ZA of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 8.26 In my opinion, subject to condition, the proposal does not pose a threat to highway safety, and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 81.

### **Car Parking**

- 8.27 The application states that the proposed nursery would have 30 employees. The Car Parking Standards in Appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, which are expressed as 'no more than' totals, would therefore permit up to 20 car parking spaces. The total proposed is 14, which is in accordance with the Standards. The layout of the car park is in my view acceptable. I recognize that parents and pre-school children will be circulating in the same space as moving cars, but such conflicts are almost inevitable. Other than in very large car parks, it is very difficult to achieve effective separation of vehicles and pedestrian users. Parents will be aware of the potential conflicts here, as they are in most car parks, and will take appropriate measures to safeguard their own children. It is not, in my view, a significant design fault in the application.
- 8.28 The application proposes two disabled car parking spaces. This meets the requirement in Appendix L of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 to provide at least one disabled space for employees and 5% (0.7 of a space) of the total provision for disabled visitors. The applicants propose to create three additional disabled car parking spaces adjacent to Trumpington House to replace those lost from the current car park.
- 8.29 Representations suggest that the proposed level of car parking on the site is inadequate, and that it is unrealistic to expect parents to use other modes of transport. I disagree with these views; the local plan continues to encourage a reduction in the provision of non-residential car parking and the use of alternative modes. This site is accessible by other modes of transport, and I do not consider it unrealistic to expect that users of the nursery will employ them. The modal split expected in the submitted Transport Assessment appears to me to be reasonable, and this predicts that even in the busiest ten-minute block of the morning peak (0800-0810) there are likely to be only seven incoming cars. Even accepting that drop-off is not

instantaneous and that parents are likely to remain on site for several minutes, I am of the view that the car park will not be overly congested, and the temptation to park illegitimately in Harrison Drive will not be strong. In most of the ten-minute blocks of the peak, the number of dropping-off cars is likely to be considerably less than this. I recognize that there is a risk, even so, that some nursery users may park and manoeuvre in an inconsiderate manner in Harrison Drive, but I do not agree that it is impossible to enforce the present parking restrictions in that street. I agree that a robust parking management plan is required; in my view such a plan will be an adequate safeguard against the negative impacts of inconsiderate car parking by nursery staff or users.

8.30 I also recognize, in common with County Councillor Taylor, that car users displaced from the present car park may be inclined to seek on-street car parking spaces in the future in uncontrolled streets on the east side of Hills Road. However, the on-street space in these streets will continue to be under extreme pressure from commuter parking regardless of whether this development is permitted. The issue can only be addressed by the imposition of parking controls.

8.31 In my opinion, subject to a condition requiring a parking management plan, the proposal is compliant with respect to car parking, with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

### **Service and Delivery Vehicles**

8.32 There are a number of representations on this issue, but they relate largely to the impact of existing service and delivery vehicle movements connected to the College, and the expected increase in such movements if the College is further developed. These are not connected to, or affected by, the proposal; in my view, if such vehicles have previously used the car park entrance as a turning point, they are likely to continue to use the nursery car park entrance for this purpose, even if the pattern of other vehicle movements into and out of this entrance is different from the present pattern.

8.33 The nursery itself is not likely to generate a significant number of service vehicle movements: there will be some deliveries, and regular waste collections, but these would not add up to a significant number.

8.34 I agree that proper access for waste collection vehicles, deliveries to the Faculty of Education, and servicing of the sewage pumping station all need to be protected, but in my view this can be ensured through a condition requiring a parking and servicing management plan, which I recommend.

8.35 In my opinion, subject to such a condition, the proposal is compliant in terms of the impact on, and of, service and delivery vehicles, with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 80, 81 and 82.

### **Cycle Parking**

8.36 Representations have asserted that there is currently insufficient cycle parking on the wider Homerton site which would be exacerbated by the proposal. However, the applicants have submitted a survey of unoccupied cycle parking spaces for the existing cycle parking space on the application site, and the other six cycle parking spaces on the Homerton site. This data, from May 2018, shows that there were a minimum of 57 unoccupied spaces in the cycle park on the application site, and a minimum of 157 unoccupied spaces on the Homerton and Faculty of Education sites as a whole. In this context, I am of the view that the total number of cycle parking spaces proposed in the application is sufficient.

8.37 Notwithstanding the view expressed in representations, I do not consider that the location of the majority of the cycle parking spaces on the south side of the car park is sufficiently inconvenient to justify refusal of the application.

8.38 I agree with the views expressed in representations, and in the advice from the landscape and cycling officers, that the provision for cargo and other non-standard cycle is inadequate, and that the configuration of two-tier racks proposed is not satisfactory, but in my view these issues, the optimal configuration of cycle parking close to the building entrance and the question of adequately protecting the cycle storage areas from motor vehicles can be adequately addressed by a condition, which I recommend.

- 8.39 In my opinion, subject to conditions, the proposal is compliant, with respect to cycle parking, with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 82.

### **Traffic**

- 8.40 The highway authority confirms that the Hill Road / Harrison Drive junction is operating well within capacity. The authority also considers that the proposal will not have any detrimental impact on the local highway network, but recommends that a travel plan fosters a reduction in single-occupier car journeys to preserve the available capacity on the network into the future. The authority also notes that the site has good bus connectivity, which will enable use of this mode to reach the site. I accept this advice and conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on Hills Road or any other part of the highway network, and would not, in this respect, cause any conflict with Cambridge Local Plan policy 81. I acknowledge that the Transport Assessment does not encompass possible future developments on the Homerton College site. It would not be reasonable to expect it to do so, nor to make a decision on this application on the basis of possible future developments elsewhere which may or may not be brought forward.
- 8.41 The applicants' Transport Assessment predicts that the total one-way car trips to and from the site during the period from 0800-1000 is likely to be 50 (28 in, 22 out). In my view the Transport Assessment contains robust estimates. The trip generation figures have been compared with data from the TRICS database, and are higher than the average figures therein, so I consider, notwithstanding the concerns expressed in some representations about the assumptions on enrolment, modal split of nursery staff travel to work, modal split comparisons with the West Cambridge nursery and the timing of surveys, they are unlikely to be an underestimate. Even allowing for possible underestimation, and allowing for a degree of concentration of these trips into the period immediately after 0800, these totals are not such as to create significant congestion in Harrison Drive, nor to create a hazard to pedestrians and cyclists, or to necessitate cyclists' riding on the footway, nor to require creation of a raised zebra crossing to enable safe pedestrian transit of the entrance to the car park.

8.42 I recognize that there are genuine concerns on the part of both Scholars' Court residents and Faculty of Education staff that car journeys to and from the nursery will create inconvenience and safety hazards in Harrison Drive. These concerns are not supported by what I consider to be a robust Transport Assessment, however, and I do not consider they are well-founded. In my view, the impact on Harrison Drive of trips generated by the proposed nursery would not create any conflict with policy 81 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018).

### **Inclusive Access**

8.43 Disability Panel raised a number of questions about the detail of inclusive access in the proposed design. In response, the applicants have confirmed that all the following features will be incorporated in the building.

- automated front door
- low-level reception counter
- induction hearing loop
- level access throughout
- colour contrasts on all internal doors
- internal door opening widths and configurations in accordance with part M of the Building Regulations
- emergency procedures
- space for short-term buggy storage in the lobby

8.44 The applicants have indicated that outward-opening doors are proposed on WCs to avoid obstructing the corridors, but that sufficient space has been provided to minimise the restrictions to inclusive access created by inward-opening doors

8.45 I note that inward-opening WC doors place some restrictions on access, but in my view this is a limited shortcoming in the context of a building which would generally provide a high level of inclusive access, and is, in this respect, in accordance with policy 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

### **Surface water and foul drainage**

8.46 Advice from the sustainable drainage team states that because the highest recorded groundwater level would be less than 300mm below the invert level of the proposed permeable paving, there is a risk of contamination of groundwater and a

risk of inundation of the system which is unacceptable, even if this is an improvement on the current drainage condition. This advice coincides with concerns raised in representations. The drainage team's advice is that in these circumstances, infiltration as a solution for surface water drainage could only be acceptable with the specific support of the Environment Agency, support which they consider to be unlikely. I share the view of the drainage team on this question, and I do not consider the possibility of an infiltration scheme to be a realistic basis on which to grant planning permission.

8.47 The only alternative surface water solution suggested by the applicants rests on mitigation measures undertaken in third party land (i.e. discharging water into the surface water drainage system on the Homerton College site). To ensure that the risk of flooding is avoided, improvements to the Homerton College drainage system would need to be undertaken before the nursery was constructed, and that improved system would need to be maintained into the future. Conditions would be necessary to ensure that an acceptably improved drainage system was constructed before the development of the nursery, and to ensure that the owners of the nursery site had the right to both discharge water into, and to maintain, the third party drainage system for the lifetime of the development. In my view, subject to a condition requiring approval and implementation of a surface water drainage scheme before the commencement of development, including the completion and submission of a legal agreement between the site owners and the adjacent landlords to guarantee the rights to discharge water and to maintain the system, this solution to surface water drainage would be acceptable. It would not be appropriate, however, to grant permission on the basis of this condition unless there is a reasonable likelihood that it could be discharged.

8.48 The applicants have submitted a copy of a letter from Homerton College confirming that the College 'is in discussions with the University regarding a technical and legal solution which would enable the proposed nursery development to utilise an enhanced surface water network along Harrison Drive'. In my view, this offers adequate reassurance that there is a reasonable possibility that the surface water condition I have recommended could be discharged. Since this condition is a 'pre-commencement condition', it has been agreed with the

applicant prior to this meeting, in accordance with Section 100ZA of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

8.49 In the event that works to the balancing pond prove necessary in the future, a separate planning application would be required. The issues raised about visual impact, landscape design and safety in connection with this pond would be considered in connection with that application.

8.50 The additional load on the sewerage system imposed by the nursery would be relatively modest. In my view, it is unlikely to overload the present system.

8.51 In my opinion, subject to the specific conditions indicated in para 8.47 above, the proposal adequately addresses the issues of integrated water management and flood risk, and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 31 and 32.

### **Trees**

8.52 I note and accept the advice of the arboricultural officer that the proposal is acceptable, and in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 71, subject to conditions. I recommend these conditions, which, since they are ‘pre-commencement conditions’, have been agreed with the applicant prior to this meeting, in accordance with Section 100ZA of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

### **Third Party Representations**

8.53 I have addressed the majority of the issues raised in representations in the above assessment. The table below indicates the respective paragraphs.

<b>Principle of development</b>	
Should be on the Addenbrooke’s site	8.1
Should not be limited to use by University employees	8.3
Erosion of open space and tree cover	8.2 and Condition 11
<b>Design in context</b>	
Insufficient outdoor space	8.7

Barely meets minimum standards for nurseries	8.8
Cladding may deteriorate	8.5 and Condition 23
Detrimental impacts of enlargement to balancing pond	8.49
<b>Neighbour amenity</b>	
Needs conditions to mitigate noise impact on houses in Corfe Close (double thickness acoustic fence, extended acoustic fence, extended wall in NE corner)	8.17-8.18 and Conditions 17 and 18
Disruption to students and researchers at Faculty of Education	8.19
Disruption to Faculty administrative staff	8.19
Increased traffic noise on Harrison Drive	8.19
Noise from laying proposed new drainage	8.19
Noise assessment unreliable	8.14
Needs conditions on construction work	8.21 and Conditions 12-16
<b>Highway safety</b>	
Hazard to safety of cyclists and pedestrians during construction	8.25
Existing safety issues at junction of Hills Road and Harrison Drive would be exacerbated	8.24
TA incorrect about visibility at Hills Road	8.24
TA incorrect about pedestrian priority at Hills Road	8.24
Hazard to vulnerable road users from drop-off traffic	8.24
Nursery-run drivers exhibit risky driving behaviour	8.24
Harrison Drive too narrow; reduction in motor traffic needed to improve safety for cyclists	8.41
Painted zebra crossing at car park entrance should be raised	8.41
TA wrong to suggest cyclists could share	8.41

narrow Harrison Drive footway with pedestrians	
<b>Parking and deliveries management</b>	
Insufficient car parking and drop-off space for nursery users; unrealistic to believe parents will use non-car modes	8.29
Parking space for visitors and services in Harrison Drive is already inadequate	8.29 and Condition 27
Parents will park in Scholars Court disabled bay	8.29 and Condition 27
Will exacerbate existing parking on yellow lines in Harrison Drive	8.29 and Condition 27
Concern that car parking restrictions in Harrison Drive cannot be enforced	8.29 and Condition 27
Vehicles will be forced to turn round in Scholars Court entrance	8.29
Will exacerbate pressure on on-street car parking nearby, already worsened by extension of the CPZ	8.30
Conflict between deliveries to / waste collection from Faculty of Education / Homerton College and nursery parents drop-off and pick-up	8.29, 8.32
Existing delivery vehicle activity connected with the College causes early morning disruption to Scholars Court residents and damage to footways. This is to be compounded by the use of larger delivery vehicles in the near future, and would be exacerbated by the addition of hundreds more car movements	8.32
No separation between car park and area where toddlers may be running about	8.27
Reduced car parking for Faculty of Education	8.29-8.30
Loss of disabled parking space at the Faculty of Education	8.28
Inadequate car parking for nursery staff	8.29
Lack of cycle parking on the site is already an issue	8.36
Only four additional cycle hoops are to be	8.36

provided	
Insufficient parking spaces for cargo bikes	8.38 and Condition 25
Cycle trailer parking space required	8.38 and Condition 25
Two-tier cycle parking is inferior	8.38 and Condition 25
Main cycle shelter on wrong side of car park	8.37
Cycle parking area not protected from cars by bollards	8.38 and Condition 25
<b>Transport issues</b>	
Detrimental impact of increased traffic flow on Hills Road	8.40
Increased traffic could cause gridlock	8.40
Transport assessment does not take account of expected future developments at Homerton	8.40
Poor bus connectivity to the site	
Enrolment profile in TA inaccurate	8.41
TA wrong to suggest nursery staff will show same modal pattern as Faculty of Education staff; former are more poorly paid, and therefore more likely to live further away and be forced to use cars	8.41
TA wrong on modal shares of car and cycle travel to West Cambridge nursery	8.41
Timing of traffic survey renders it unreliable	8.41
<b>Drainage</b>	
Pressure on surface water network	8.46 and Condition 9
Existing issues with surface water overloading the foul sewer and causing serious odour problems	8.46 and Condition 9
Overloading of foul sewage pumping station	8.50
Obstruction of access to service sewage pumping station	8.34 and Condition 27

- 8.54 I address the remaining issues raised in representations below.
- 8.55 I am of the view that the representation expressing anxiety about the nursery being sited 'in a car park' is either based on a misreading or misunderstanding of the application proposal, or else was made without benefit of seeing the full details.
- 8.56 The proposed nursery would not be part of the Faculty of Education, and would not be associated with it. I do not believe that harm would be caused to the Faculty's reputation simply by geographic proximity. Protection of the Faculty's reputation is not within the remit of the local plan, but, as I have indicated above, I do not consider the space standards of the proposed building to be unacceptable, and the quality of provision in the nursery will depend to a much greater extent on other factors, which are the subject of different regulatory regimes.
- 8.57 I acknowledge that to involve pre-school children actively in the design process for a building of this type is a laudable aspiration, but I do not consider that the absence of such a process renders the building less than high-quality, and I do not consider that it involves any conflict with policies 56 or 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
- 8.58 In my view, aircraft noise on this site is only occasional, and not at a level to cause disturbance to the users. The environmental health team have not raised this issue, and I do not consider it creates any conflict with policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

## **9.0 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 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by 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. Submission of Preliminary Contamination Assessment:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) or investigations required to assess the contamination of the site, the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

(a) Desk study to include:

- Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive materials)
- General environmental setting.
- Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.

(b) A report setting set out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

4. Submission of site investigation report and remediation strategy:

Prior to the commencement of the development (or phase of) with the exception of works agreed under condition 3 and in accordance with the approved investigation strategy agreed under clause (b) of condition 3, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

(a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors

(b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing the works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

5. Implementation of remediation.

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or each phase of the development where phased) the remediation strategy approved under clause (b) to condition 4 shall be fully implemented on site following the agreed schedule of works.

Reason: To ensure full mitigation through the agreed remediation measures in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

6. Completion report:

Prior to the first occupation of the development (or phase of) hereby approved the following shall be submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

(a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by condition 4 and implemented under condition 5 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use.

(b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved material management plan) shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean-up criteria.

Thereafter, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: To demonstrate that the site is suitable for approved use in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

7. Material Management Plan:

Prior to importation or reuse of material for the development (or phase of) a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall:

- a) Include details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site
- b) Include details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused material
- c) Include details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site.
- d) Include the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development
- e) Include confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

All works will be undertaken in accordance with the approved document.

Reason: To ensure that no unsuitable material is brought onto the site in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

8. Unexpected Contamination:

If unexpected contamination is encountered whilst undertaking the development which has not previously been identified, works shall immediately cease on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified and the additional contamination has been fully assessed and remediation approved following steps (a) and (b) of condition 4 above. The approved remediation shall then be fully implemented under condition 5.

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 33.

9. Prior to the commencement of development (other than demolition) a scheme for surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include an assessment 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 the National Planning Policy 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 + an allowance for climate change. The submitted details shall include the following:

- 1) 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;

- 2) 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 for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

- 3) Specifically, if the surface water drainage scheme requires discharge of water to infrastructure on adjoining sites not within the ownership of the applicants (or their successors in title), the submitted details shall include a legal agreement between the applicants and the adjoining landowners which confirms the right of the applicant to carry out the required works, maintain them thereafter, and discharge water to them throughout the lifetime of the development.

The approved details shall be fully implemented on site prior to the first use/occupation and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate surface water drainage.  
(Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 31 and 32)

10. Prior to occupation a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the approved scheme shall be fully operational prior to the first occupation of the building, and retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate water supply infrastructure to protect the safe living and working environment for all users and visitors (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 56 and 57).

11. Prior to commencement and in accordance with BS5837 2012, a phased Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval, before any tree works are carried and before equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of development (including demolition). In a logical sequence the AMS and TPP will consider all phases of construction in relation to the potential impact on trees and detail tree works, 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 supervision, demolition, foundation design, storage of materials, ground works, installation of services, erection of scaffolding and landscaping.

Prior to the commencement of site clearance a pre-commencement site meeting shall be held and attended by the site manager, the arboricultural consultant and LPA Tree Officer to discuss details of the approved AMS.

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 the TPP, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the local planning authority. If any tree shown to be retained is damaged, remedial works as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority will be carried out. If any tree shown to be retained is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and safeguarding trees that are worthy of retention (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 59 and 71).

12. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 81)

13. In the event of the foundations for the proposed development requiring piling, prior to the development taking place, other than demolition, the applicant shall provide the local authority with a report / method statement for approval detailing the type of piling and mitigation measures to be taken to protect local residents from noise and/or vibration. Potential noise and vibration levels at the nearest noise sensitive locations shall be predicted in accordance with the provisions of BS 5228-1&2:2009 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Due to the proximity of this site to existing residential premises and other noise sensitive premises, impact pile driving is not recommended.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties.  
(Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

14. 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 2018 policy 36.

15. 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 2018 policy 35)

16. There shall 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 2018 policy 35)

17. The mechanical services plant, auxiliary equipment and specified mitigation hereby approved shall be installed / implemented fully in accordance with the operational noise levels and noise mitigation scheme measures as specified in the submitted BDP noise impact assessment report dated 18th October 2018 (rev P02, doc no: HDN-BDP-XX-XX-RP-YA-0002) .

The plant / equipment operational noise levels and noise mitigation scheme measures shall be fully maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 35)

18. The nursery hereby approved shall be open to children only during the hours 0800-1800 Monday to Friday.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35, 55 and 56)

19. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft Landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. 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.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59)

20. Prior to first occupation or the bringing into use of the development, hereby permitted, a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas, other than small privately owned domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaped areas shall thereafter be managed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is maintained as part of the development. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59)

21. No works to construct the external play area on the east side of the building shall take place until full details of the layout, the surface and the location of fixed and movable play equipment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The play area shall be laid out in accordance with the approved details and maintained in that condition thereafter, and play equipment shall be positioned only as specified in the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 35, 55 and 56)

22. No development above ground level, other than demolition, shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation or the bringing into use of the development (or other timetable agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate boundary treatment is implemented in the interests of visual amenity and privacy (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 57 and 59)

23. External finish materials on the buildings hereby approved shall be erected only once details of those materials have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved materials shall be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure the building responds positively to its context. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 55, 56 and 57)

24. No works above ground level (other than demolition) shall commence until a plan detailing the proposed specification, number and locations of internal and / or external bird boxes on the new buildings has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The installation shall be carried out and subsequently maintained in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To provide ecological enhancements for protected species on the site. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 70)

25. Prior to any works above ground level, other than demolition, full details of facilities for the secure parking of bicycles, including cargo bikes and other non-standard bicycles in connection with the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the use commences and shall be retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 82)

26. No occupation of the building shall commence until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall specify the methods to be used to discourage the use of the private motor vehicle and the arrangements to encourage use of alternative sustainable travel arrangements such as public transport, car sharing, cycling and walking. The Travel Plan shall be implemented as approved upon the occupation of the development and monitored in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging sustainable travel to and from the site (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 80 and 81).

27. No occupation of the building shall commence until a Parking and Servicing Management Plan (PSMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The PSMP shall specify the methods to be used to:

Ensure safe and efficient operation of the car park area  
Prevent illegitimate and inconsiderate parking in and adjacent to, Harrison Drive  
Facilitate necessary access to the approved building and nearby buildings by delivery, waste collection, service and emergency vehicles

The PSMP shall be implemented as approved upon the occupation of the development and monitored in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the safety of users of the area and avoid inconvenience and delays for those using Harrison Drive. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018, policies 56, 80, 81 and 82).

28. Prior to the first occupation/use of the development, details of equipment for the purpose of extraction and filtration of odours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved extraction/filtration scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted is commenced and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby properties. (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policy 36)