

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE MEETING – 22 June 2022

Amendment Sheet

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: 3

APPLICATION REF: 21/03224/FUL

Location: Cambridge Airport, Newmarket Road, Cambridge

To Note:

1. Paragraph 15.27 (Page 45 of Agenda) (Impact on human health arising from visual impact of proposed H17 radar). To clarify, officers support the conclusion of the submitted ES (Paragraph 11.50 and associated summary table) that the visual impacts are not considered to be significant in health terms at either nearby residential receptors or for recreational users of Coldham's Common.

Paragraphs 15.112, 15.117, 15.121 (Noise - References to 55 Receptors). To clarify, the ES noise assessment is based on, and refers to, 33 Receptors (R1 – R33). These receptors comprise some individual properties and some that are made up of groups of properties. The EHO has referred to 55 receptors as the total number of properties counted cumulatively from the Council's address point database. This does not alter the overall conclusion on noise impact.

Paragraph 15.113 (Page 60 of Agenda) (Noise; Day Assessment Period). To clarify, in terms of BS4142, these are considered indicative of a gradual degree of lower impact. There is a decrease in the significance of impact as the negative value (-) difference increases.

Paragraph 5.117 (Page 60 of Agenda) (Noise; Significance of Noise Impact Summary; Evening Assessment Period). To clarify, the calculated noise levels at receptors R2, R3 and R4 are also between 4.0 and 5.0 dB below background levels.

Paragraph 15.117 (Page 60 of Agenda) (Noise; Significance of Noise Impact; Evening Assessment Period). To clarify, in terms of the GCSP Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2020), all but three receptors are in the 'None' or 'Minimal' Noise Significance Risk, with the remaining in the 'Low' category. For 'Low', the SPD advises that: *'this indicates that the proposed Noise Generating Development may be acceptable from a noise perspective but will be more context dependent'*.

Paragraph 15.123 (Page 61 of Agenda) (Noise, Night Assessment Period). To clarify, in terms of the GCSP-SPD (202), 19 receptors are in the ‘None’ or ‘Minimal’ Noise Significance Risk, with the remaining 14 in the ‘Low’ category, with a Noise Significance Effect: NOEL to LOAEL.

Paragraph 16.1 (Page 64 of Agenda) (Traffic and Transport). To clarify, the traffic/transport impacts arising from the construction phases of the development have also been assessed within the ES, which finds no significant adverse impacts.

Paragraph 17.4 (Page 64 of Agenda) (Impact on Residential Amenity). For the avoidance of doubt, the following table summarizes the potential key issues that are relevant to a consideration of residential amenity and identifies the significance of these impacts in EIA terms (based on submitted Environmental Statement).

Issue	Description of Effect	Significance
Noise	Health impacts on noise from the H17 Radar	Not significant
Visual	Overall effect of visual impacts on health	Not significant
Electro-magnetic radiation	Health impacts of radio frequency fields from the H17 Radar	Not significant
Shadow flicker	Annoyance effect from shadow flicker due to rotating H17 Radar	Not significant
Air quality	Health impacts from dust and air quality during construction and operational phases	Not significant
Contaminated land	Health impacts from groundwater contaminant sources during construction phase	Not significant
Safety of users, local residents and employees	Existing AR165 Radar coming to end of operational life. Proposals will maintain existing aircraft movements safely	Not significant
In-combination effects	In-combination effects of noise and visual impacts on stress and anxiety	Not significant.

Paragraph 19.1 (Page 66 of Agenda) (Green Belt). To clarify, the proposed H17 Radar will be situated some way to the north of the existing Green Belt boundary. Officers are of the view that the development does not conflict with national and local planning policies which seek to protect the openness of the Green Belt.

Proposed planning conditions and EH planning consultation response (Appendices C and D, pages 79 and 85 respectively of Agenda). To note, an additional planning consultation response relating specifically to planning conditions was provided by the EH Officer and dated

08 June 2022. This formed the basis of the proposed planning conditions, which have been agreed by the Applicant. The consultation response dated 08 June 2022 is attached as an Appendix to this briefing note.

Amendments To Text: None.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

1. Proposed Condition 3 (Removal of AR15 Radar) (Appendix C, Page 71 of Agenda):

Minor change to include the words 'following commissioning' after 'H17 Radar' as follows:

'Condition 3 - Removal of AR15 Radar

*Within three months of the first operation of the H17 Radar (**following commissioning**), the AR15 Radar (shown on the plans hereby approved) shall be removed from the site and the site shall be restored in accordance with the programme of work set out in Appendix A3.2 (Construction Environmental Management Plan) of the Environmental Statement: Cambridge City Airport, Radar Replacement Project, July 2021 and in accordance with drawing 20591-RPS-CBG-XX-DR-C-2003-P01 (AR15 Radar Site - Proposed Plan (Restored Site)).*

Reason: In the interests of good planning and to ensure that the decommissioned AR15 Radar is removed from the site when the H17 Radar comes into first use'.

2. Proposed update to officer recommendation (Section 23.0 of officer report, Page 70 of Agenda):

Additional criteria (iii) to address the requirements of the EIA Regulations with regard to the decision making process:

'(iii) With delegated authority to officers to set out as part of the planning decision notice and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017, Regulation 29 'information to accompany decisions' a reasoned conclusion of the significant effects of the development on the environment and to carry out appropriate notification under regulation 30 accordingly'.

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: 4

APPLICATION REF: 21/04036/REM

Location: Lots S1 And S2, North West Cambridge Development Eddington
Avenue Cambridge

To Note:

Late Representations have been received from two addresses:

Middlefield – Comments expanding on concerns relating to construction management, in particular working hours, in the context of a large development over an extended time period.

Arcady – Expressing disappointment about the lack of communication from the developer, University, and Council. Drawing the committee's attention to previously expressed concerns with the proposed development's impact as well as the accuracy of information submitted by the developer.

These issues are addressed within the published Committee Report.

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: Recommendation to defer the application to enable further discussions to take place with the Council's' Housing Officers regarding the application of national planning policy guidance and the Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy with regard to Build to Rent.

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: 5

APPLICATION REF: S/1355/17/FL , 07/0003/NMA2 & 07/0003/NMA2

Location: Land Immediately West Of The Electricity Pylon And Foul Pump Station
Histon Road Impington

To Note: None

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

APPENDIX 1 – PLANNING CONSULTATION RESPONSE DATED 08 JUNE 2022

PLANNING CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Responding Officer:	Greg Kearney
Date:	08-06-2022
Planning Ref No:	21/03224/FUL
Tascomi Ref No:	2204/21 & 2531/21
Description of Development:	Cambridge Airport, Newmarket Road, Cambridge, Dismantling and removal of two existing radars and the construction of a new radar and other associated works. <u>Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017 (EIA Regs): Environmental Statement</u>

Cross one:

The development proposed is **acceptable** subject to the imposition of the condition(s)/informative(s) outlined below.

The development proposed is **unacceptable** and should be refused for the reason(s) set out below.

It is not possible to fully comment on the proposed development and the additional information set out below will be required in order to provide comments.

Further to our Environmental Quality and Growth - EQG planning consultation response memo dated the 11-02-2022 we have reviewed the conditions as previously recommended.

Review of the conditions was considered necessary as upon reflection there is concern that they do not meet the planning tests for conditions.

They did not actually set clear and precise operation noise limits for the radar, there was ambiguity in the wording and potential for multiple interpretations which may have given rise to enforcement issues.

Therefore, we have simplified the conditions and recommend the following:

- 6. Unexpected Contamination**
- 7. Construction Environmental Management Plan & Working Hours**
- 8. Standby Emergency Back Up Generator Operation**
- 9. H17 Radar - Noise Insulation Condition**
- 10. H17 Radar – Permitted Operational Sound Levels**
- 11. H17 Radar - Operational Sound Verification Assessment Report**
- 12. Non-Compliance With Radar Sound Verification Assessment Noise Limits**

With regard to condition 10 the limit of 33dB LAeq,15minute has been determined from the modal lowest hourly background period during the night (2am-3am) of 35dB LA90,15minute as measured by Three Spires at a representative location of the closest properties on Barnes Close to the H17 Radar and includes an agreed 2dB correction for tonality resulting in a limit level of 33dB LAeq,15minute.

As the source is continuous it is considered that there is no need to apply both hourly daytime and shorter at night. Night is critical and main driver to protect amenity when background noise levels lower.

The previously assumed/ factored in 2dB correction for tonal is subjective to interpretation and we wish to remove or limit any disputes on its application hence the proposal to remove it and use a simple LAeq Equivalent Continuous Sound Pressure Level. The aim is to keep simple to avoid BS4142 Rating level corrections because of subjective element of the method in terms of character correction selection and interpretation.

This 350m zone covers the majority of residential properties which could be affected and provides clarity to residents.

It is our view that the condition 10 provides residents with certainty that they all will be protected and allows for a spot check to be undertaken anywhere within the 350m radius next to a residential receptor. Also, why would the applicant have an issue if compliance is achieved at the closest

dwelling. It also allows for any issues which may arise due to faults in the equipment or cabin which may mean that the noise is not evenly propagated from the source and if inherent radar cabin mitigation deteriorates or similar.

This limit is considered appropriate to ensure that unacceptable adverse effects are prevented, significant adverse effects are avoided and adverse effects are mitigated and minimised. The condition also allows the operator of the Radar Tower to measure at a proxy location closer to the source and calculate the sound level to the noise sensitive receptor locations, applying the above methodologies, without the need to access noise sensitive premises or reference to the Local Planning Authority and where the influence of extraneous noise is limited by ensuring measurements are dominated by the Radar noise.

Regards,

Greg Kearney

Principal Environmental Health Officer

Environmental Quality & Growth Team

Environmental Services

Cambridge City Council