

<b>Application Number</b>	17/0705/FUL	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	8th May 2017	<b>Officer</b>	Mr David Spring
<b>Target Date</b>	7th August 2017		
<b>Ward</b>	Queen Ediths		
<b>Site Proposal</b>	The Bell Educational Trust Ltd Red Cross Lane Installation of a replacement Multi Use Games Area (MUGA)		
<b>Applicant</b>	Bell Educational Trust c/o Agent		

<b>SUMMARY</b>	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The development would have an acceptable impact on the character of the area</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The development would not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity.</li> </ul>
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	APPROVAL

**1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

1.1 The Bell Education Trust is an English language school for international students, which has been established on this site for more than 50 years. The application site is located at the southern end of the school’s grounds and consists of hard-surfaced sports pitches.

1.2 To the east of the sports pitches are the rear gardens of residential properties on Babraham Road. A line of mature trees (that are protected by Tree Preservation Orders) and planting runs along the boundary with these properties. To the south is the access road to Nine Wells and to the west is a recently constructed block of flats. It is understood that these flats are now all occupied.

1.3 The school site has a Protected Open Space designation over much of its grounds.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

2.1 Planning permission is sought for the installation of a replacement Multi Use Games Area (MUGA).

2.2 Currently in this space there are three tarmac courts, two for tennis and one for basketball. These would be replaced by the proposed single astro-turf pitch to be used mainly for football. Over the course of this proposal the area of this pitch has been slightly reduced and details provided of a proposed acoustic fence enclosure. This would be sited around the eastern, southern and western sides. The majority of the fence would be 4m high, with the northern half of the western boundary reducing to 3m in height. This fence would be sited between the pitch, which would be enclosed by a 4.5m high mesh fence, and the perimeter of the site.

2.3 Further amendments were received on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2018. These amendments consisted of:

1. Removal of the proposed climber from the western fence line to enable the hedge to grow in the space between its current location and up to the acoustic fence at a height of between 3.5 and 4 metres.

2. The insertion of two gates at the southern end of the pitch, within the pitch fencing to enable access for landscape maintenance only.

3. The allowance for the beech hedge at the southern end of the site adjacent to the proposed acoustic fence to be allowed to reach between 4 and 4.5 metres in height.

4. The production of a Landscape Management Plan to demonstrate the ability for the proposed landscaping to be retained in situ and ensure its ongoing survival and successful growth as proposed in the Landscape Plan.

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

- 3.1 Under planning application references 06/0795/OUT and 13/1118/S73 planning permission was granted for residential development and student accommodation on land that was owned by the Bell School. Much of the site was known as the Pony Field and part of the site was occupied by a football pitch, used by the school. The provision of the MUGA within the grounds of the Bell School is in response to the S106 requirements of that planning permission (13/1118/S73). This states that the student accommodation should not be occupied until two Multi-Use Games Areas have been provided within the school site (or a contribution paid to the Council if not provided).The Council at the time of the original outline application (planning reference 06/0795/OUT), took the view that the provision of housing outweighed the loss of the football pitch, especially as it was a private facility for the Bell School and that there was still capacity within the remainder of the school grounds to provide a replacement.
- 3.2 Reserved matters consent for the development of the adjacent land was approved under application ref 13/1786/REM.

### 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 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.
- 5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2018	1 31 32 35 44

	55, 56, 59 67 69 70 71, 73, 81
--	--------------------------------------

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

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2019 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 Circular 11/95
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
Material Considerations	<u>City Wide Guidance</u> Arboricultural Strategy (2004) Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001). Cambridge Landscape and Character Assessment (2003) Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide (2006)

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

### **Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)**

- 6.1 The Highway Authority does not consider that this application has any implications that merit comment by the Highway Authority.

#### **Environmental Health**

*Original comments (received 30/5/17 and 17/8/17)*

- 6.2 The submitted acoustic assessment includes noise mitigation measures (a 2m high bund to the east, combined 3m and 4m high fences to the west, and a 3m fence/barrier to the south) that have not been included in the drawings. These barriers are essential to prevent harm to neighbouring properties and full details must be provided as part of the application to ensure they are appropriate to the Local Planning Authority from a visual point of view and therefore likely to be delivered.

*Revised comments following submission of further details of the acoustic fence enclosure (received 24/10/17)*

- 6.3 No objection to the amended scheme which has an acoustic barrier subject to the following recommended conditions which would curtail noise pollution on site to an acceptable level. These include:

- The noise barriers must be built in accordance with the plans.
- The MUGA shall only be used Monday – Friday 08:00-18:00.
- The MUGA shall only be used by Bell School students.
- The MUGA shall not be used for hockey (this is potentially noisier than football and the submitted noise assessment has only considered noise impacts from football).
- An Operational Noise Management plan should be put in place.
- Restrict construction and collection/delivery hours during construction.

## **Landscaping Team**

### *Original comments*

- 6.4 The proposed acoustic fence would be sited in the narrow space between the site boundary and the MUGA fence. This raises concerns about how maintenance of the hedges, fences and gap between the fences will be achieved.

### *Comments on amended plans (received 14/1/19)*

- 6.5 The proposal is acceptable. The resubmission has adequately resolved outstanding concerns about maintenance access, screening and planting proposals. Landscape can now support the proposals.

## **Streets and Open Spaces (Trees)**

- 6.6 No arboricultural objections to the original proposed for the bund. With regard to the revised proposal for fencing to the eastern side, the works required to trees to accommodate the fencing will be locally, visually significant but will have no material impact on tree health or public amenity contribution. In order to protect the trees from construction activity, a site specific and phased tree protection method statement will be required, which can be secured by condition.

## **Drainage**

- 6.7 The subbase depth will need to be of adequate size to ensure an expected usability of the proposed MUGA during and following rainfall events. Surface water should be contained within the site up to the 1 in 100 year + 40% allowance for climate change. A condition requiring further details of surface water drainage works is therefore recommended.

## **Lead Local Flood Authority**

- 6.8 No objection subject to a surface water drainage condition being added to any consent.

## **Environment Agency**

- 6.9 No objection. The application falls within flood risk standing advice and it will therefore be necessary for the Council's Drainage Manager to respond on behalf of the EA in respect of flood risk and/or surface water drainage issues.

## **Sport England**

### *Original Comments*

- 6.10 No objection as the proposal is considered an enhancement of existing sporting facilities without affecting any other sports pitches or sports facilities.

### 6.11 *Revised Comments*

Sport England's position remains that they support this proposal subject to a restrictive hours of use condition as previously discussed, but that the impact on residential properties with regard to potential noise disturbance needs to be assessed under the relevant Environmental Protection legislation, by qualified Environmental Health Officers.

## **Developer Monitoring Unit**

- 6.12 The Developer Contributions Monitoring Unit (DCMU) does not propose to seek specific S106 financial contributions under the council's Planning Obligation Strategy SPD 2010, as Cambridge City Council does not seek S106 financial contributions from such developments.

## **Nature Conservation Officer**

- 6.13 The ecological survey and report submitted are acceptable. The proposed ecological enhancements should be included on a plan for approval prior to determination, or a condition requesting such a plan and installation prior to occupation should be imposed.

## **Designing Out Crime**

- 6.14 No concerns regarding community safety or crime issues.
- 6.15 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 Councillor Pippas has requested that the application be referred to Planning Committee if Officers are minded to support the application, as he considers the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of local residents.
- 7.2 Councillor Moore expresses concern regarding noise due to the proposed use for football pitches. The MUGA should be located further away from residential properties as it would be unreasonable to limit the time that students use the facilities.
- 7.3 Councillor McGerty expresses concern that the development would have undue noise implications for current and future residents of Knightly Avenue, Urwin Gardens and Babraham Road.
- 7.4 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:
- Babraham Road Action Group
  - 2 Babraham Road
  - 4 Babraham Road
  - 4a Babraham Road
  - 6 Babraham Road
  - 6b Babraham Road
  - Gog Magog Partnership
  - 5 Knightly Avenue
  - 12 Knightly Avenue
  - 18 Knightly Avenue
  - 1 Urwin Gardens
  - 29 Urwin Gardens
- 7.5 The representations can be summarised as follows:

*Visual impact/character of the area*

- The proposed acoustic fencing would have a detrimental visual impact and be harmful to the character of the area. The latest drawings suggest the boundary hedge can grow to a height of 4-4.5m and that the fence would be concealed behind the hedge. However, as it is a deciduous hedge, it would not conceal the fence in the winter months.
- The hedge and trees along the southern boundary should be retained.
- Further details should be submitted to demonstrate the visual impact the proposed fencing would have on the area.

### *Noise and disturbance*

- The maximum noise impact on upper rooms of surrounding houses/apartments is predicted within the reports to exceed acceptable levels.
- The predicted decibel level of 73.2 db would have a detrimental impact on the adjacent apartments in Knightly Avenue.
- The noise report identifies three locations where the worst case noise scenario is unacceptable.
- No.1 Urwin Gardens and the adjacent apartment block are incorrectly identified within the original documentation as 2 storey rather than 3 storey properties. The addendum addresses this but, even with the height of the acoustic fence to the southern boundary being increased from 3m-4m, the noise modelling still shows an unacceptable noise impact.
- Sport England's Acoustic Design Guidance asserts that 50 decibels should be regarded as the maximum loudness to avoid annoyance of neighbours. It also draws attention to the fact that noise is often louder above the area protected by sound barriers. The 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor levels of the adjacent properties will therefore be adversely affected.
- If most noise originates from human voices, the sound levels set out in the tables of various receptor points in the vicinity of this MUGA are not accurate.
- Sport England recommends that MUGAs are at least 12m away from residential boundaries, and ideally 30m away. The distance between the proposed MUGA and the new apartments appears to be only about 4m.
- The existing courts are used for tennis and basketball. The proposed MUGA would mainly be used for 5-a-side football which is a much noisier game. The ball smashing repeatedly into the outside fencing is unacceptable in a residential area.

- The MUGA is also likely to be very heavily used when the proposed student accommodation block is eventually built.
- Some residents comment that any permission should be subject to the physical noise mitigation measures requested by the Environmental Health Officer, as well as hours of operation being restricted to accord with those specified by the applicant. Usage at the weekends and evenings would not be appropriate.
- Other residents, however, consider that the proposed acoustic fence and restricted hours would not be sufficient to curtail the adverse impacts upon neighbours, many of whom are retired and therefore at home during the day.
- The acoustic fencing would be very prominent in the outlook from the adjacent block of flats to the west. Cross section drawings should be submitted to show this impact.
- The noise report has not been updated to reflect the change from the bund to acoustic fence along the eastern boundary.
- There are no other examples of MUGAs located so close to residential properties.
- There would be an unacceptable noise impact to the bedroom and second floor terrace of No. 5 Knightly Avenue.
- Noise issues could be avoided by moving the MUGA further north.
- Clarification should be sought as to whether any floodlighting is intended.

### *Use*

- No objection to the use of the area solely for the use of tennis or basketball.
- Students have access to pitches at Trumpington Community College.
- The Southern Fringe developments provide for sporting facilities at Great Kneighton where there is a MUGA. Here, full size as well as 5-a-side football can be played.
- The original sport facilities of the school were sold for housing.
- It is inevitable that footballs will be kicked over the perimeter fencing and these present a real threat to cyclists and passing vehicles, as well as potentially resulting in damage to nearby properties.

### *Impact on trees*

- Major crown and root works are being proposed to trees on the eastern boundary that are covered by a TPO, without any consultation/comment from the Council's Trees Officer. Any crown reduction would also make the sports pitch more visible from properties on Babraham Road.
- Impact on trees and wildlife at the southern end of the site.

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

## **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

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

1. Principle of development
2. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Residential amenity
4. Impact on trees

### **Principle of Development**

8.2 As noted within Section 3 of this report, the site lies adjacent to the Ninewells development, part of which includes land that was formerly within the School's grounds and used as a football pitch. One of the S106 obligations for this site required two Multi Use Games Areas (MUGA's) to be provided within the Bell School's grounds (or a contribution paid) in order to offset the loss of sports facilities arising from the development.

8.3 This application relates to an area of land at the southern end of the school's grounds, which is currently laid out as hard-surfaced/tarmacked sports pitches, comprising two tennis courts and one basketball court. The proposal seeks to resurface this area with astro-turf and to use the new pitch primarily for five-a-side football. Significant concerns have been raised by local residents on the grounds that 5-a-side football would result in greater noise disturbance to nearby residents than either tennis or basketball. These amenity impacts are explored in further depth later in this report. With regard to the

principle of using the land for other sports, it should be noted that the site lies within the existing school grounds and that the application is not proposing any change in the use of the land. There are currently no restrictions on either the type of sport or hours of operation of the existing pitches. As such, the existing pitches could be re-surfaced and used for any sport without the need for planning permission or the introduction of noise mitigation measures. This fall-back position has been taken into consideration in my assessment of the proposal.

- 8.4 Much of the Bell Educational Trust site is allocated within the Local Plan as Protected Open Space. Policy 67 of the Cambridge Local Plan states *'Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons'*. One of the types of open space protected by this policy is outdoor sports facilities. The proposed MUGA seeks to replace the existing facility which has become under-used due to tree root damage to the surface. Sport England supports the proposal, stating that it would increase opportunities for pupils to take part in sport without compromising any other recreation facility on the site. The proposal is also consistent with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that existing open space is only used for alternative sports and recreation provision.
- 8.5 In my opinion, the principle of replacing and upgrading the existing sports pitches is acceptable, and accords with Policy 67 of the Local Plan as well as the aims of the NPPF.

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

- 8.6 The replacement surfacing would not have a greater visual impact on its surroundings than the existing tarmacadam surface. However, during the consideration of the application, concerns were raised by the Environmental Health Officer regarding the likely intensification in use arising from the upgraded pitch, and also to the increased noise associated with football rather than tennis and basketball. In response to these concerns, the application has been amended to include an acoustic barrier around three sides of the pitch. The proposed acoustic fencing would be 4m high to the eastern and southern

boundaries, and 4m high along the southern half of the western boundary, reducing to a height of 3m along the northern extent of this boundary. The existing sports pitches are currently enclosed by mesh fencing, but the site is relatively open, with views out of the school into the new Ninewells development and vice versa.

- 8.7 There are attractive hedges along the southern boundary of the site with Knightly Avenue, and forming the western boundary with the adjacent apartment block. Officers had concerns that, in spite of these hedges, the required acoustic fencing would be prominent in views from the south and at the approach to the Ninewells development, particularly as the Landscape Officer had raised concerns regarding the practicality of maintaining the boundary hedges and proposed fences. Officers therefore sought to explore whether the proposed pitch could be repositioned further to the north and whether, in turn, this would reduce the height of any required acoustic attenuation.
- 8.8 Prior to the submission of the application, the applicant's agent sought pre-application advice on the location of the two sports pitches required through the S106 for the wider site. A number of suggested locations, which included a site immediately to the north, were considered unacceptable due to the impact on protected trees.
- 8.9 The applicant's agent advised that the acoustic consultants undertook further modelling associated with the suggested repositioning, and this demonstrated that, whilst this may improve noise levels for some properties, it actually worsens the situation for other properties (R9, R10 and R12 in the original survey) and also has no impact on the required acoustic fence height (and the EHO has since advised he concurs with these conclusions). On this basis, the agent requested that the Council consider the application as submitted.
- 8.10 A meeting was subsequently held with the applicant, applicant's agent, Environmental Health Officer and Landscape Officer in order to explore whether there would be a way in which a 4m high acoustic fence could be satisfactorily screened. The Landscape Officer commented that it would be possible for the existing hedges to grow to a height of 4-4.5m along the southern boundary and 3.5-4m along the western boundary, and that the landscape scheme should be designed so that the

hedges could fill the space to the fence line. The plans have since been amended accordingly, and a landscape management and maintenance strategy provided. The revised details have resolved the Landscape Officer's concerns and demonstrated that the hedges can be managed to reach their full potential height, thereby providing adequate screening of the acoustic fencing and ensuring that the impact on the character and appearance of the area would be acceptable.

- 8.11 In my opinion the proposal would have an acceptable visual impact and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56 and 59.

### **Residential Amenity**

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

#### Relationship with adjacent dwellings

- 8.12 The proposed MUGA lies in close proximity to a number of residential property. Neighbours closest to the proposal include six apartments in the three storey Reach House to the west. These are located between 6.3 and 7.3 metres to the edge of the pitch and between 6.7 and 5.7 metres away from the acoustic fencing. Other adjoining neighbours are located further away and include Nos. 4, 4a and 6b Babraham Road to the east, and No. 1 Urwin Gardens to the south. The rear boundaries of Nos. 4 and 4a Babraham Road adjoin the eastern boundary of the site, albeit are separated by very long, approximately 40 metre deep, rear gardens. No. 6b Babraham Road and No. 1 Urwin Gardens are located on the opposite side of Knightly Avenue to the site.

#### Noise

- 8.13 Local residents have raised significant concerns regarding the increased noise the replacement MUGA would create. The majority of residents would have no objections to the area being used for tennis and basketball but consider that a use primarily for 5-a-side football will create far more noise nuisance than the existing pitches.

- 8.14 The Environmental Health Officer considers that the proposed MUGA has the potential to intensify the use of the area, including for a wider range of sports than at present, and that this could result in noise issues if used for 5-a-side football or similar recreational activities. The submitted noise report concludes that there would be detrimental impacts to the occupiers of a number of nearby residential properties and, as a result, the proposal includes mitigation in the form of acoustic fencing adjacent to the three sides of the pitches adjoining residential properties. In response to concerns raised by local residents, the original noise assessment was updated to consider the impact on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor habitable rooms at 1 Unwin Gardens, and the EHO has raised no objections to its findings, stating that the levels would likely be the same as the storey below.
- 8.15 In addition to the acoustic screen, Environmental Health has also recommended a number of conditions to further ensure noise emissions are acceptable. These include:
- Limiting hours of use to Monday to Friday 08:00 – 18:00
  - Restricting the use of the all-weather pitch to pupils at the school.
  - Preventing use for hockey.
  - Requiring an operational noise management and monitoring plan.
  - Restricting construction and construction delivery hours.
  - And limiting construction delivery hours.
- 8.16 I concur with all the above except for the suggested hours of use. No flood lights are proposed, which does restrict the use of the pitch to daylight hours, and the language school is locked at 6pm every day. Having discussed the proposed conditions with the applicant, they have expressed a wish to use the MUGA from 8am-1pm on Saturdays. In my opinion, these hours are reasonable and would not give rise to significant adverse harm to the amenities of adjacent residents.
- 8.17 In my opinion, the proposal would result in the provision of an improved sports facility for the school, whilst also providing mitigation in the form of a noise barrier and restrictive conditions, that are not in place at present, and would not be in force if the applicant were to utilise its permitted development rights to resurface and reuse the existing pitch for other sports.

8.18 A number of local residents have raised concerns that the proposal conflicts with Sport England's guidance that MUGAs should be at least 12m, and ideally 30m, away from residential boundaries. Sport England has clarified that the documentation referred to relates to full-size floodlit pitches used for formal sport such as football and hockey, so is not applicable to this proposal. In addition, the 12m threshold was referred to in guidance that has since been superseded, and the current guidance contains no distance criteria.

#### Enclosure from acoustic barriers

8.19 Residents to the south and in the apartments to the west have expressed concern regarding the enclosing impact of the proposed acoustic fencing. The nearest dwellings are the apartments to the west, which have living room and bedroom windows and balconies on the elevation facing the site. The living room windows in the southern part of the eastern elevation are the closest windows overlooking the site. These are secondary windows, as the living rooms are also served by large openings and balconies to the front. I therefore consider the outlook to and light from the windows, notably those at ground and first floor level, would not be unduly compromised by the acoustic fencing. The northern part of the eastern elevation is recessed further away from the boundary and comprises, on each level, two bedroom windows and a lounge window with balcony, and these are all the primary/sole windows serving the rooms in question. In order to minimise the impact on these properties, the acoustic barrier is proposed to be sited behind the hedge line, which would be managed to grow to a height of 3.5-4m, and along the northern half of the boundary, reduces to a height of 3m. In my opinion, given this separation from windows in the rear wing of the adjacent block, I consider the proposal would not have a harmful enclosing impact upon the occupiers of these properties.

8.20 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and I consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 35, 55, 56 and 59.

## **Impact on trees**

- 8.21 There are a number of mature trees notably adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site that are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's). The Tree Officer raised no objections to the initial proposal, which proposed a 2m high bund to the east. The scheme has since been amended to include a 4m high acoustic fence along the eastern boundary, and the arboricultural impact assessment has been revised to assess the impact of the revised boundary treatments upon the protected trees. None of the protected trees are proposed to be removed, although it is proposed to crown lift a number of protected trees that overhang the pitch, as well as to remove three lower quality apple trees near to the southern boundary. The Trees Officer has advised this will have a visual impact but that it wouldn't adversely affect the tree health or public amenity contribution of the trees.
- 8.22 Subject to the condition recommended by the Trees Officer, I consider the impact of the proposal upon the trees adjacent to the eastern boundary would be acceptable, and the proposal compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policy 71.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 This proposal would have an acceptable impact on the character of the area and, subject to the provision of an acoustic fence and other noise mitigation restrictions, the impact on the amenities of adjacent residents would be acceptable.

## **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 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. 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)

4. 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)

5. Prior to the bringing into use of the MUGA, hereby permitted, the acoustic barrier shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details, and shall be maintained in accordance with these details thereafter. The MUGA shall be constructed/installed and then maintained and retained thereafter fully in accordance with the submitted drawings and specifications / details, specifically:

- SSL1873 drawing no. 07b (rev 1) dated 07/12/2017
- SSL1873 drawing no. 07 (rev 2) dated 07/12/17
- Jacksons Fine Fencing drawing no. J7/04177 dated 10/01/08 (updated 18/07/2012) (Jakoustic Fencing treatment - absorptive modification).

- MAS Environmental Ltd, 'Bell School Red Cross Lane, Cambridge Noise Impact Assessment for Multi Use Games Area (MUGA)', (reference BET170213) dated 13th February 2017 - in particular, the noise mitigation measures detailed within Section 5.3 and Figure 5
- MAS Environmental Ltd 'Bell School, Red Cross Lane, Cambridge Noise Impact Assessment for Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) Addendum to MAS report dated 13th February 2017' (ref: BET170213), dated 28th June 2017.
- Surfacing Standards Limited 'Bell School, Red Cross Lane, Cambridge: Construction of an external 5v5 mini soccer 3G Artificial Turf Pitch (ATP) with fencing and hard standing pathways - Technical Information to Assist Planning' (Project Code: SSL 1873 - 07/03/2017) including the installation of resilient fittings / neoprene insert washers to the perimeter ball stop fencing (open mesh panels) to reduce panel rattle & vibration from ball impact.

Reason: To protect/safeguard the health and quality of life (amenity) of residential premises in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and aims of Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

6. The MUGA hereby approved shall not be used other than during the following hours:

Monday-Friday 08:00-18:00

Saturday 08:00-13:00

There shall be no use on Sundays or on Bank/Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect/safeguard the health and quality of life (amenity) of residential premises in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and aims of Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

7. The MUGA shall only be used by Bell School students/pupils (those enrolled at school) and shall not be made available for use by the wider community.

Reason: To protect/safeguard the health and quality of life (amenity) of residential premises in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and aims of Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

8. Before first use of the MUGA hereby permitted a 'Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) Operational Noise Management and Monitoring Plan' to incorporate a User's Code of Conduct shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. 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, as well as details of a written complaints procedure/action plan. The approved plan shall be implemented in full and adhered to at all times.

Reason: To protect/safeguard the health and quality of life (amenity) of residential premises in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and aims of Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

9. The MUGA hereby approved is not to be used for Hockey.

Reason: To protect/safeguard the health and quality of life (amenity) of residential premises in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and aims of Policy 35 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

10. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out in section 4 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report dated October 2016 by Denny Ecology.

Reason: To ensure that the development of the site conserves and enhances ecology (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies 69 and 70).

11. No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a surface water drainage scheme based on sustainable drainage principles has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage system should be designed such that there is no surcharging for a 1 in 30 year event and no internal property flooding or flooding of third party land for a 1 in 100 year event + 40% allowance for climate change. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.

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

12. Prior to commencement and in accordance with BS5837 2012, a phased tree protection methodology in the form of an 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 tree protection methodology 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 approved tree protection plans, 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 on the approved tree protection methodology is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies within five years of project completion, 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: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that trees to be retained will be protected from damage during any construction activity, including demolition, in order to preserve arboricultural amenity in accordance with section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 71: Trees.