

Application Number	11/1052/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	2nd September 2011	Officer	Miss Sophie Pain
Target Date	28th October 2011		
Ward	Newnham		
Site	Cambridge Lawn Tennis & Hockey Club Wilberforce Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB3 0EQ		
Proposal Applicant	Floodlighting to three existing tennis courts. Mr J Mills Wilberforce Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB3 0EQ		

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 The Cambridge Lawn Tennis and Hockey Club lies towards the southern end of Wilberforce Road on the western side. The site is accessed off Wilberforce Road via a short access road. The site comprises a single storey clubhouse, ten all weather full size courts, two all weather mini courts and six full size grass courts and a car parking area.
- 1.2 Adjacent to the site to the north of the tennis courts are hockey pitches and northeast is the Emmanuel College Sports Ground. To the east Wilberforce Road and predominantly large detached residential dwellings. Land to the immediate south accommodates the University Athletics Centre, which comprises a two-storey pavilion building, athletics track and field, a hockey pitch and car parking areas. To west of the site is the residential area of Perry Court and Clark Maxwell Road.
- 1.3 The site is located within Cambridge City Conservation Area No.2 (West) and allocated within the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) as a protected open space. The site falls outside the controlled parking zone (CPZ).

1.4 There is a protected belt of trees along the eastern boundary between the application site and Emmanuel College Sports Ground and two protected trees on the western boundary with Perry Court.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The applicants seek planning permission for the installation of twelve floodlighting columns, which each measure 8 m in height to illuminate courts 3, 4 and 5 which are located on the southern most row of courts.

2.2 The proposed floodlights provide two luminaries to each pole on the north and south boundaries of the courts and the two poles, one between court 3 and 4 and one between court 4 and 5. The remaining six poles, three to each the east and west boundaries of the courts will have a single luminary, providing 18 luminaries in total.

2.3 Each of the floodlights will have a green painted box with front baffles in order to reduce the light spillage and light pollution in the area. These baffles assist in focusing the light towards the courts. The columns will be finished in green in order to allow them to blend with the surrounding area.

2.4 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Ecology Report
3. Topographic surveys
4. Lighting Design Report

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
11/1058/FUL	Construction of three all-weather synthetic clay tennis courts.	Approved
10/0914/FUL	Erection of floodlights to courts 3, 4 and 5.	Application returned
09/0648/FUL	Erection of floodlights to courts, 3, 4 and 5.	Refused and Appeal

08/0591/FUL	Floodlighting to tennis courts.	Dismissed
07/1244/FUL	Installation of floodlighting to Tennis Courts.	Refused
C/95/0580	Erection of twelve 8 metre high columns supporting nineteen floodlights illuminating three tennis courts.	Withdrawn
C/93/0899	Erection of floodlights and masts to 2 tennis courts.	Refused
		Approved

3.1 The previous planning application (09/0648/FUL) was refused for failing to provide sufficient justification for the proposed height, frequency and duration of use together with the potential for light spillage to the surrounding area that would be likely to have an adverse impact on the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of adjacent dwellings. The application was appealed and the appeal was subsequently dismissed.

3.2 The Inspector concluded that there was no objection to the principle of the floodlights of the three courts. In relation to assessing the impact on living conditions, the Inspector was satisfied that the levels of proposed light spillage was acceptable. However, she dismissed the appeal on the basis that as there was no existing information provided about the existing lights on courts 1 and 2 it was difficult to compare. Together with the use of metal halide lighting and the height of the proposed poles, it would be likely to result in a significant increase in glare. From the information provided it was difficult to assess whether or not the proposed lighting would be harmful for the neighbouring residents and that the upper floors of the residential properties would be at significant risk of glare from the proposed lights.

4.0 PUBLICITY

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

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central Government Advice

Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (2010)
PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (2005)
PPG17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (2002)
Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions

5.2 East of England Plan 2008

ENV6: The Historic Environment
ENV7: Quality in the Built Environment

5.3 Cambridge Local Plan 2006

3/4 Responding to context
3/7 Creating successful places
3/11 The design of external spaces
4/2 Protection of open space
4/3 Safeguarding features of amenity of nature conservation value
4/4 Trees
4/11 Conservation Areas
4/13 Pollution and amenity
4/15 Lighting
6/2 New leisure facilities

5.4 Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance

Draft National Planning Policy Framework (July 2011)

The National Planning Policy Framework (Draft NPPF) sets out the Government's economic, environmental and social planning policies for England. These policies articulate the Government's vision of sustainable development, which should be interpreted and applied locally to meet local aspirations.

Letter from Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (27 May 2010)

The coalition government is committed to rapidly abolish Regional Strategies and return decision making powers on housing and planning to local councils. Decisions on housing supply (including the provision of travellers sites) will rest with Local Planning Authorities without the framework of regional numbers and plans.

Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)

Includes the following statement:

When deciding whether to grant planning permission, local planning authorities should support enterprise and facilitate housing, economic and other forms of sustainable development. Where relevant and consistent with their statutory obligations they should therefore:

- (i) consider fully the importance of national planning policies aimed at fostering economic growth and employment, given the need to ensure a return to robust growth after the recent recession;
- (ii) take into account the need to maintain a flexible and responsive supply of land for key sectors, including housing;
- (iii) consider the range of likely economic, environmental and social benefits of proposals; including long term or indirect benefits such as increased consumer choice, more viable communities and more robust local economies (which may, where relevant, include matters such as job creation and business productivity);
- (iv) be sensitive to the fact that local economies are subject to change and so take a positive approach to development where new economic data suggest that prior assessments of needs are no longer up-to-date;
- (v) ensure that they do not impose unnecessary burdens on development.

In determining planning applications, local planning authorities are obliged to have regard to all relevant considerations. They should ensure that they give appropriate weight to the need to support economic recovery, that applications that secure sustainable growth are treated favourably (consistent with policy in PPS4), and that they can give clear reasons for their decisions.

City Wide Guidance

Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001)
Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy (2006)

Area Guidelines

West Cambridge draft Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

6.1 No Comment

Head of Environmental Services

6.2 As light travels in straight lines it can be easily modelled and it is noted that the number of poles allow for a high number of luminaries which target the light. The proposed luminaries with deflectors are shown as being installed so that they are parallel to the ground, preventing a direct view of the lamp, which would cause glare. The installation also minimises spill and direct upward light. However, I can find no confirmation that the lighting will meet the requirements of the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) or the details in table 16 A of British Standard BS EN 12193:2007 Light and Lighting - Sports Lighting. I advise clarification is obtained.

Recommendation that the hours of use should be conditioned as suggested in the amended design and access statement.

The area is made up of similar sporting facilities including the athletics track, hockey pitches and Emmanuel College Sports Ground as well as neighbouring residential accommodation.

Considering these existing activities and the sound of the tennis coaches and games being played at the time of my visit, I do not believe noise from extended use of the courts, with the suggested restriction to the hours of use, will cause noticeable harm to the amenity.

Sport England

- 6.3 We remain of the view that these latest proposals will allow the club to grow in terms of participation in tennis, as it will allow members to use the facilities on offer for longer periods, particularly in the winter months.

We note that the submitted details make compromises with regard to the details of the floodlighting scheme put forward and the proposed hours of use of the floodlit courts. Sport England welcomes these compromise solutions put forward in an attempt to satisfy concerns from local residents.

From the above information it is clear that there is a real need for the club to expand in terms of level of court use it can offer its members and we believe that the latest proposals can deliver these qualitative improvements without adversely affecting residential amenity for local residents.

Sport England therefore fully supports this application, which will offer opportunities to increase participation in tennis in the Cambridge area, thus meeting wider government objectives to increase participation in sport generally. Any consent should be subject to conditions restricting hours of use of the proposed floodlights in line with the proposals put forward by the applicants in their planning statement.

Historic Environment Manager

- 6.4 There will be more masts visible during the day and more illumination in the area but it is considered that the impact on the character of the Conservation Area will be modest. It has been recommended that a condition controlling the hours of use would be appropriate.

Natural England

- 6.5 This proposal does not appear to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes, or have significant impacts on the conservation of soils. However, the protected species survey has identified that reptiles may be affected by this application and that a detailed mitigation and monitoring strategy for grass snakes needs to be undertaken prior to the commencement of works. As a result, such guidance can be conditioned appropriately.

Nature and Conservation Project Officer

- 6.6 The ecology report identified no habitats of particular significance that would be affected. The report suggests that the proposed flood lighting would not increase light fall on the boundary hedges due to appropriate light sources and deflectors. This appears to be the case when looking at the Lux figure. However, it would be useful to be able to compare with a map showing existing Lux levels on the boundary features.

Landscaping Officer

- 6.7 As the proposal stands, the landscape team would recommend refusal of this application on landscape and visual amenity grounds. However, should this application be approved, we would suggest that the lighting columns should be limited to 6m in height and painted black, to enable them to be more readily absorbed into the existing daylight landscape.
- 6.8 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 Reid has requested that this application be determined at West/Central Committee in the event that Officers are minded to recommend approval given the history of the site and the need to discuss the concerns regarding the floodlights and their potential impact upon the neighbouring residents.

7.2 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations in support of the application:

- 5 Drake Way, Impington
- 21 Chesterton Hall Crescent
- 37 Carisbrooke Road
- 27 Brookside
- 5 Fulbrooke Road
- 27 Fulbrooke Road
- 27 Newmarket Road
- 16 West Road, Histon
- 3 Templemore Close
- 10 Templemore Close
- 48 Halifax Road
- 34 Victoria Park
- 26 Aylestone Road
- 8 Cavendish Avenue
- 65 Gough Way
- 87 Beaumont Road
- Kendal House, Scotland Road, Dry Drayton
- 25 Greystoke Road
- 2 Woodlark Road
- 35 Church Street
- 22a Church Street, Harston
- 141 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford
- 75 High Street, Girton
- Mill House, Farm Lane, Thriplow
- 8 Cavendish Way, Highfields Caldecote
- 46 Weavers Field, Girton
- 125 High Street, East Chesterton
- 129 Town Street, Newton
- 4 Bird Farm Road, Fulbourn
- 17a Home Close, Histon
- 66 Glisson Road
- 11 Chapel Street, Waterbeach
- 12 Milford Street
- 11 Church Street, Haslingfield
- 3 Perry Court
- 10 Perry Court
- 15 Perry Court
- 43 High Street, Oakington
- 111 Granchester Meadows
- 8 James Carlton Close, Milton
- 4 St Stephens Place

- 27 Champneys Walk
- 10 The Lawns, Clerk Maxwell Road
- 26 Briars End, Witchford
- 33 High Street, Trumpington
- The Terrace, Hampden Gardens
- 14 Gilbert Road
- 11 Storeys Way
- 1A Roland Close
- 6a Church Lane, Abington
- 59 Richmond Road
- 4 The Precincts, Ridley Hall, Ridley Hall Road
- 11 Courtney Way
- 58 Rustat Road

- 5 provided no postal address, but have e-mail addresses.

7.3 The following local Resident's Associations made representations in support of the application;

- North Newnham Residents Association
- Clerk Maxwell Road Residents Association

7.4 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- The floodlights would improve facilities at the club and allow evening play, which has been prevented until now due to the lack of lit courts;
- It allows members to play the year round and provides evening coaching sessions for juniors and adults; and
- Providing a condition is imposed for the hours of use of the lights and that the lights are installed in accordance with the submitted specification, it is considered that nearby residents will not be harmed by the proposal;

7.5 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations objecting to the application;

- 19 Clarkson Road

7.6 The representation can be summarised as follows:

- Excessive lighting disturbs the evenings and will exacerbate the existing light spill, which is seen from the Athletics Track.

7.7 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. The type of floodlighting
3. Context of site, design and external spaces
4. Residential amenity
5. Wildlife and trees
6. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 The principle of floodlighting and the appropriateness of such development on this site has already been accepted by the granting of previous permission C/93/0899 for the erection of floodlights and masts to serve tennis courts 1 and 2.

8.3 Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 6/2 states that development for the improvement of a leisure facility will be permitted if it improves the range, quality and accessibility of facilities, is of an appropriate scale for the locality, and would not have a negative impact on the vitality and viability of the City Centre. Intensive-use sports facilities such as floodlit multi-use games areas and synthetic turf pitches contribute greatly to sports development. Proposals for these will be supported provided there would not be undue intrusion or significant adverse impact on the immediate locality or wider environment.

8.4 This application must, therefore, demonstrate that the proposed lighting is appropriate to the surrounding area, and that this would improve the quality of the existing sports facility. I am satisfied that this application appears to firmly enhance sporting provision in Cambridge by developing an existing facility to ensure that its use is maximised to make the best use of land and facilities. I consider that the improvement and enhancement of existing facilities that allow these facilities to

evolve with changing needs over time are not unreasonable and are supported by policy 6/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 that notes the scarcity of land for such developments and promotes the efficient use of land for such uses in suitable locations. There is no intrinsic harm in the development of this existing sports site to meet contemporary requirements and this is the most efficient and effective use of such sites.

- 8.5 Sport England has stated that they are supportive of the proposal which is in compliance with Sport England policy and wider government objectives to raise participation in sport and physical activity. They state that there is a strong strategic case for improving these facilities and acknowledge the compromises made by the applicant in an attempt to satisfy the concerns from local residents.
- 8.6 In making my recommendation I am also mindful of planning application 07/0939/FUL which proposed the erection of floodlights to serve the athletics track and existing and proposed hockey pitches at the University Sports and Athletics Track adjacent to the south of the application site.
- 8.7 The Inspector when considering the appeal (planning reference 09/0648/FUL) considered that it was evident from the club's submission that there was a clear need for additional floodlighting to make effective use of the facilities during winter months and to satisfy the needs of the rapidly growing membership and would be consistent with Policy 6/2. The same evidence has been submitted with this application and I consider that it remains clear that there is indeed a need for floodlighting and that Sport England also support this view.
- 8.8 I consider that the use of the site for sports and recreation purposes has already been accepted and this function is part of the existing landscape character and appearance of surrounding area, and that tennis clubs such as these are primarily suburban institutions and their presence is to be expected in such areas. I consider the installation of the proposed floodlights to be beneficial to this existing site, significantly enhancing its quality and accessibility. As such, the development is considered acceptable, in principle, and is therefore in accordance with policies 4/2 and 6/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Levels and Use of Floodlighting

- 8.9 Policy 4/15 requires proposals including new external lighting to demonstrate that the lighting proposed is the minimum required to undertake the task. The Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) Factsheet 'Floodlighting Outdoor Tennis Courts' provides guidance on the installation of floodlights. It indicates that the minimum standard of illumination should be an average of 300 lux on the total playing area (TPA), which means the court and the areas outside it at the ends and sides which form part of the playing area. The recommended average is 400 lux.
- 8.10 In the previous application the floodlighting scheme exceeded the recommended standard with an average of 562 lux for the TPA. This proposal seeks an average of 300 lux, which is considered acceptable and meets the minimum standard of illumination on the TPA.
- 8.11 The guidance also refers to the principle playing area (PPA) where the minimum average is 400 lux with a recommended average of 500 lux. The previous proposal sought an average of 604 lux. This application seeks 400 lux, again meeting the minimum requirement for the PPA.
- 8.12 It is also proposed to install a switch, which reduces the overall light level when all three courts are lit so that two of the light fittings will switch off. This will ensure that the flood lighting does not cumulatively exceed the recommended standards within the LTA guidance.
- 8.13 In order to maintain the correct light levels on the court in accordance with the above guidance, there has been a need to increase the number of poles and luminaries in order to achieve a consistent light level across the courts.
- 8.14 The applicant has also proposed hours of use of the floodlights, which take into consideration the effect that the proposed lights may have upon astronomical observation evenings, which occur on Wednesday nights throughout the winter at the Institute of Astronomy located nearby. The proposed hours of use are;
- No use at any time on a Sunday throughout the year;
 - March through to October – Monday to Saturday no use after 10.00 pm;

- November and February: Monday to Tuesday & Thursday to Saturday no use after 10.00 pm, with Wednesday no use after 8.00 pm; and
- December and January: Monday to Tuesday & Thursday to Saturday no use after 10.00 pm with Wednesday no use after 7.00 pm.

8.15 Such hours of use are considered to be appropriate and are reflected at the Athletics ground adjacent to the site. As such, the development is considered acceptable, in principle, and is therefore in accordance with policy 4/15(a) of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.16 Cambridge Local Plan policy 3/4 states that development must positively respond to its context, and Local Plan policy 6/2 that development for sports or leisure facilities must be of an appropriate scale for its locality. Policy 4/2 of the Local Plan states that 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.

8.17 Policy 4/15 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 specifically refers to lighting and states that development which includes new external lighting or changes to existing external lighting should provide details of the lighting scheme demonstrating that it is the minimum required to undertake the task (taking into account safety and crime), light spillage is minimised, the impact on residential amenity is minimised and the impact on wildlife and the landscape is minimised, particularly on sites at the edge of the City.

8.18 The site is visible from Wilberforce Road itself, but is located behind the Emmanuel Sports Field, which also has a variety of sports equipment and lighting in the foreground. The site is visibly developed as a sports ground and is notably a manmade landscape including the clubhouse, associated car parking, hard surfacing and existing flood lighting to serve the two eastern most tennis courts closest to the club house and the residential estate of Perry Close.

8.19 The application proposes to use 12 x 8 m high poles to mount the proposed floodlights. This application proposes 4 poles

more than the previous application, in order to reduce glare, and the Inspector was aware that 8 poles would be the smallest number of poles, which could be used to light the 3 courts. The existing poles on Courts 1 and 2 are 6 m in height and as a result the proposed poles will be 2 m higher. An alternative scheme using 6 m high poles has been explored with the applicants, but if these were proposed then a greater number of poles would be required in order to light the courts correctly without increasing the light spill. Given that the poles will be aligned with the nets, that they will be well spaced and finished in green, as well as the fact that the lighting poles at the adjacent Athletics ground are up to 16 m, the proposed 8 m high poles are considered to be acceptable in this volume, height and location.

8.20 It is acknowledged that there will be some visual impact upon the area when the floodlights are in use, but the Inspector considered that as the area proposed in the previous application was relatively small, any harm would be slight upon the established recreational character of the area. As the proposed number of courts to illuminate has not increased, I consider that this view remains valid.

8.21 I am satisfied that vegetation which serves to significantly screen the existing courts and lighting columns from Perry Close and Wilberforce Road will similarly serve to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed floodlighting during hours of natural light upon the street scene of Wilberforce Road and the surrounding Conservation Area and as such I am of the opinion that the proposal is compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policies ENV6 and ENV7, and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 4/2, 4/11, 4/15 and 6/2.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

8.22 One of the key considerations in the assessment of this planning application is whether the submitted scheme would result in a significant material detriment to the amenity of nearby residential properties.

8.23 To the east, Wilberforce Road is about 175 m away and it is clear that these dwellings are too far away for the proposed

development to be harmful to the living conditions of their occupants.

- 8.24 The nearest housing to the proposed development is Perry Court about 45 m to the west of the site. Courts 1 and 2, which are already floodlit lie between the proposed development and these houses. The appearance of the lighting poles during daylight will be clearly visible from properties in Perry Court, but they will not be prominent or intrusive, despite the increase of 4 poles from the previous application. The key assessment is that of light emanating from the site and whether this would result in significant harm to nearby residential occupiers.
- 8.25 I am aware that the area of illuminated space will be significantly greater than the area currently illuminated and as such there may be a greater visual awareness of the site when it is illuminated. Information submitted with the application demonstrates that given the contours of the site the lux levels will fall to 0 on the edge of the site, closest to Perry Court, which is an improvement on the previous application where lux levels were 10 in the same location. However, in the previous application, the Inspector was concerned as there was not sufficient information to determine if the glare from the proposed lights would be harmful to the upper floors of properties in Perry Court.
- 8.26 Information has been submitted with the current application from the Institution of Lighting Engineers, who recommend that to keep glare to a minimum, the main beam angle of all lights directed towards any potential observer is no more than 70 degrees. Higher mounting heights enable the compliance with 70 degrees and can assist in reducing glare. The submitted drawings show the luminaries at no more than 70 degrees, which is considered acceptable. The Environmental Health Officer has recommended a condition to provide suitable control over the angle of the lighting heads, which I do not consider is reasonable.
- 8.27 Environmental Health have raised no objection to the proposal. With that response in mind, and given that no further conditions have been recommended by that section other than that suggested above, I am satisfied that there will be no significantly detrimental impact from the lighting upon the

residential occupiers of the nearby residential occupiers in relation to the specific aspects of this scheme to warrant refusal.

- 8.28 In my opinion the proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and constraints of the site and as such consider that it is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7 and 4/13.

Wildlife and Trees

- 8.29 It is acknowledged that artificial lighting can affect a range of species, and so their presence in and around the site should be considered in relation to any potential effects the lighting may have upon them. The applicant has submitted an Ecological Scoping Survey given the ecological sensitivity of the site and its location near to the green belt. Based on the information provided in this survey Natural England raises no objections to the proposed development but requests conditions be imposed as recommended by the survey. These include the filling of gaps in the existing hedgerow to the south of the site and allowing the hedgerow to thicken in order to help screen any light spillage towards nearby ponds and ensuring that directional hoods are installed to the proposed luminaries in order to minimise the impact upon wildlife whilst the lights are in use. Natural England acknowledges that the survey was undertaken at the correct time of year and has recommended a condition, which requires a detailed mitigation and monitoring strategy for grass snakes. Subject to the imposition of the above recommended condition I consider the proposal compliant with policy 4/3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).
- 8.30 The Nature and Conservation Project Officer is relatively comfortable with the results of the ecology report although has requested existing lux levels for Courts 1 and 2. These have been provided and forwarded on to the Officer and any additional comments will be reported on the amendment sheet prior to Committee.
- 8.31 Given that the protected trees are between 15 m and 35 m away from the courts it is considered that the proposals will not have any detrimental impact upon the health and life of the trees. I consider the proposal compliant with policy 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

Third Party Representations

8.32 I consider that I have addressed all points raised within the letters of objection and support from neighbours, members of the club and resident associations.

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 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The floodlights hereby approved shall be switched off when not in use or by the following times unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation;

No use at any time on a Sunday throughout the year;
March through to October: Monday to Saturday no use after 10.00 pm;
November and February: Monday to Tuesday & Thursday to Saturday no use after 10.00 pm, with Wednesday no use after 8.00 pm; and
December and January: Monday to Tuesday & Thursday to Saturday no use after 10.00 pm with Wednesday no use after 7.00 pm.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby residents (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 4/13 and East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7)

3. The hedgerow along the southern boundary of the site shall be improved by way of planting with the same species during the next practicable planting season following this permission. All planting works shall be carried out to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendation of the appropriate British Standard or other recognised code of good practice and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. Any planting that, within a period of five years after planting, is removed, dies or becomes damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of similar species, size and number unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation. These improvements shall be made in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To thicken the hedgerow in order to mitigate against the impact of light spillage upon nearby pond life (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/7).

4. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority, the approved lighting columns, luminaries and baffles as specified in the submitted Lighting Design by Luminance Pro Lighting Systems Lts, Reference 2760e and dated 12/07/2010 shall be installed.

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

5. Prior to the first use of the approved floodlights, a mitigation and monitoring strategy for the protection of grass snakes in accordance with Natural England Technical Information Note TIN102, Reptile Mitigation Guidelines shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the protection of a protected species habitat (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/6).

Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

East of England plan 2008: ENV6 and ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006):
3/4,3/7,3/11,4/2,4/3,4/4,4/11,4/13,4/15 and 6/2

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

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

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

These papers may be inspected on the City Council website at:
www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess
or by visiting the Customer Service Centre at Mandela House.