

Application Number	11/0900/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	10th August 2011	Officer	Miss Sophie Pain
Target Date	5th October 2011		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	Hills Road Sixth Form College Sports Ground Sedley Taylor Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire		
Proposal	Demolition of existing Sports Pavillion and replacement and relocation of new replacement Sports Pavillion, with associated secure open air store.		
Applicant	Hills Road Sixth Form College Hills Road Cambridge CB2 8PE		

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 Hills Road Sixth Form College Sports Ground is located separately from the main sixth form campus on land, which has Long Road to the south and Sedley Taylor Road to the east. The sports ground comprises of land owned directly by the College and a further parcel of land to the south, which is owned by a Trust, of which the College is one of the trustees, and is shared with the Cantabrigian Rugby Club. To the west of the site is the Cambridge to London railway line and to the north is Homerton College. Along the length of the playing fields, the site is bordered by residential properties, which are on the west side of Sedley Taylor Road. These properties are all detached with gardens averaging 60 m in length, abutting the application site.
- 1.2 There is an existing pavilion situated on the eastern boundary of the site, approximately at the mid-point of the playing fields. It was built in the 1930's and is traditional in appearance with a hipped pan tile roof central to the building and two flat roofed

extensions, one to either side, which provides changing facilities for sports teams.

- 1.3 There are two narrow access roads, which lead down to the playing fields, one from the corner of Sedley Taylor Road and Luard Road (north access) and the second is between 23 and 23a Sedley Taylor Road (south access). The latter of these two access roads is used predominantly to serve the Cantabrigian Rugby Club car park and clubhouse.
- 1.4 The site presently has two football pitches, two rugby pitches and a cricket pitch.
- 1.5 The site is allocated as protected open space in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006). On the eastern boundary with properties in Sedley Taylor Road, the tree belt is protected by tree preservation orders. No.23 Sedley Taylor Road is grade II listed.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The applicants seek planning permission to demolish the existing sports pavilion and to relocate it to the south on the playing fields, constructing a building, which is better suited for its purposes.
- 2.2 The building has been designed in order to accommodate changing facilities for both sexes, a team room, visitor facilities and official's changing. This has resulted in a linear form for the building, which has an open veranda for spectators and team members, all underneath a gable end roof, which has a low eaves height of 2.5 m rising to a ridge of 8 m.
- 2.3 The proposed use of materials are horizontal and vertical timber boarding natural stained and a standing seam grey metal roof. The open veranda is protected when not in use by sliding timber shutters, which are fixed shut to provide security to the building.
- 2.4 The open-air storage to the rear of the building is protected to the north and south sides by a 2.4 m high metal fence to secure the area.
- 2.5 The new pavilion would be located 23 m into the playing fields, to the north of the existing Cantabrigian car park, 20 m from the

common boundary with properties on Sedley Taylor Road. The building takes the form of an 'L' shape. The front elevation of the building, which fronts the playing field is 36.5 m in length and has a side return on the northern elevation, which measures 11 m in depth.

2.6 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Design and Access Statement
2. Arboriculture Report
3. Archaeological Report
4. Drainage Statement
5. Ecology Report

3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 No relevant site history

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes
DC Forum (meeting of 28 th September 2011)	Yes

5.0 POLICY

5.1 Central Government Advice

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)
Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (2005)
Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport (2001)
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

SS1: Achieving Sustainable Development
T9: Walking, Cycling and other Non-Motorised Transport
T14 Parking
ENV7: Quality in the Built Environment

5.3 Cambridge Local Plan 2006

- 3/1 Sustainable development
- 3/4 Responding to context
- 3/7 Creating successful places
- 3/11 The design of external spaces
- 3/12 The design of new buildings
- 4/2 Protection of open space
- 4/3 Safeguarding features of amenity or nature conservation value
- 4/4 Trees
- 4/9 Scheduled Ancient Monuments/Archaeological Areas
- 6/2 New leisure facilities
- 8/2 Transport impact
- 8/6 Cycle parking
- 8/10 Off-street car parking
- 8/18 Water, sewerage and drainage infrastructure

5.4 Supplementary Planning Documents

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

5.5 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.

The Draft NPPF includes a set of core land use planning principles that should underpin both plan making and development management (precised form):

1. planning should be genuinely plan-led
2. planning should proactively drive and support the development and the default answer to development proposals should be 'yes', except where this would

compromise the key sustainable development principles set out in the Draft NPPF

3. planning decisions should take into account local circumstances and market signals such as land prices, commercial rents and housing affordability and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business community
4. planning decisions for future use of land should take account of its environmental quality or potential quality regardless of its previous or existing use
5. planning decisions should seek to protect and enhance environmental and heritage assets and allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value
6. mixed use developments that create more vibrant places, and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land should be promoted
7. the reuse of existing resources, such as through the conversion of existing buildings, and the use of renewable resources should be encouraged
8. planning decisions should actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable
9. planning decisions should take account of and support local strategies to improve health and wellbeing for all
10. planning decisions should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The Draft NPPF states that the primary objective of development management is to foster the delivery of sustainable development, not to hinder or prevent development.

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

Cambridge City Council (2011) - Open Space and Recreation Strategy.

Cambridge City Council Open Space Standards Guidance for Interpretation and Implementation (2010)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Engineering)

First Advice (12.08.2011)

- 6.1 Recommendation that conditions are applied to any permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue in regard to this proposal requiring that no demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been agreed with the Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

The principle area of concern is that the traffic management plan should address are;

- i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
- ii. Contractor parking, for both phases all such parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street.
- iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
- iv. Control of dust, mud and debris, please note it is an offence under the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or debris onto the adopted public highway

Second Advice (05.10.2011 at request of Case Officer)

Local residents have raised the issue of on-street parking and the need to require provision from the developer to accommodate its needs within the site.

The issue of on-street parking is an existing one.

Having reviewed the submission, including the Design and Access Statement, and given that the application is for the replacement of the existing pavilion with a new structure serving the same purpose, albeit with a slightly enlarged floor area, and that no new facility, such as a bar/function room has been added, there is no argument that the situation is made significantly worse by the existing proposal, and therefore no requirement for addressing detriment.

Third Advice (21.10.2011 after submission of traffic survey by residents)

Whilst the new pavilion will make use of the site more attractive, it is the sports facility itself that is the generator.

The application does not increase the number of pitches, nor does it vary their type or distribution between sports.

The existing pavilion could, as I understand the situation, be renovated to improve facilities.

Therefore replacing the pavilion, provided the amenities remain unvaried, and by that I mean provided they do not add a significant additional facility, say, a room and supporting facilities capable of holding an organised function such as a dance, dinner or similar organised entertainment function (which would need an appropriate permission), does not alter the site capacity in terms of trip generation, which is determined by the number of teams attending the site.

The evidence gathered by Dr Muthesius relates to existing problems associated mainly with the link formed by Sedley Taylor Road/Luard Road from Long Road to Hills Road avoiding the delays at the junction of Hills Road and Long Road, and its proximity to Addenbrookes.

These are existing issues which the application to replace the pavilion will neither resolve nor, in planning terms, make materially worse. The developer cannot, in my opinion, be expected under the planning system to resolve them, nor can any betterment be required of the developer.

Cambridgeshire County Council (Archaeology)

- 6.2 Archaeological records indicate that the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential. Extensive excavations conducted to the south east (Addenbrookes, Guided Bus Scheme and Southern Fringe settlement sites) have demonstrated the presence of established late prehistoric and Roman settlements surrounded by organised field systems and enclosures for arable, horticultural and pastoral usage.

Therefore it is considered that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation and recommend that this work should be commissioned and undertaken at the expense of the developer. This programme of work can be secured through the inclusion of a negative condition.

Sport England

- 6.3 It is recognised that the proposed development will necessitate the relocation of the rugby pitch, which currently overlaps the site of the proposed pavilion, but this could be satisfactorily achieved within the remaining site.

Sport England are satisfied that the proposal meets exception E2 of Sport England's policy 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England' (1997) as the proposal is ancillary to the principle use of the site as a playing field and does not affect the quality or quantity of existing pitches, or adversely affect their use.

It also delivers additional benefits for sport in terms of the removal of the existing pavilion, which currently compromises the use of the main cricket square, as well as the quantitative and qualitative improvements to provision through the design of a modern, purpose-built facility, which meets current standards and legislative requirements with regards to full accessibility.

Finally, it delivers an additional sporting benefit with regard to the addition of a secure external storage compound for ground maintenance and sports equipment.

Sport England supports the application, subject to the imposition of conditions relating to the provision of Rugby Pitch 1 and the reinstatement of land after the demolition of the existing pavilion.

Head of Planning Policy

6.4 No comment.

Head of Environmental Services

6.5 No objection but recommendation of conditions relating to construction hours, dust mitigation and plant noise in order to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Arboriculture Officer

6.6 No Objection, Subject to adherence to Acacia Arboricultural Report dated 20th July 2011.

Nature and Conservation Officer

6.7 The roof void of the structure proposed for demolition has potential as a roost site, particularly given the age and location. It is suggested that an external and internal inspection for bats be undertaken. September or October would be fine for such a survey. This should not be conditioned.

Sustainable Drainage Engineer

First advice (6.09.2011)

6.8 The proposal to separate foul and surface water is welcomed and the use of an infiltration system is also fully supported, although an above ground infiltration basin with an overflow connected to the existing ditch should be considered

However, the use of an infiltration system should be backed up with adequate ground investigations, particularly as no

alternative drainage proposal has been discussed if infiltration is not a suitable option.

With regard to the foul, it is possible that no history of blockages is due to the existing system being a foul system. Self-cleansing velocities not being met can be an issue but it is also dependant on the condition of the existing pipe. It should be stated how far off meeting self-cleansing velocities the foul system will be and the condition of the existing pipe. The 'adequate provision of access' should also be indicated and it should be stated how this will be managed.

Second advice (04.10.2011) (following 03.10.2011 information)

- 6.9 Further information has been submitted by applicants regarding foul water and this is satisfactory. However, there is still no plan B with regard to surface water disposal should the ground not be suitable for infiltration. Although infiltration is fully supported, prior to infiltration being proposed testing should be undertaken to ensure it is appropriate.

Cambridge City Council Access Officer

- 6.10 As the changing rooms are only serving grass area sports then no provision for wheelchair users needs to be done. It may be useful to keep the proposed accessible toilet and shower, but the college may wish to fit this with additional fixtures (for example to make it an officials room as well).

Colour contrast should be considered in the decoration scheme as blind spectators for cricket, football and rugby are growing in popularity.

All toilet doors need to either open inwards or have release catches as people can collapse after physical exercise.

- 6.11 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 Swanson has requested that this application be determined at South Area Committee if officers are minded to

approve the application as concerns relating to intensification of use and access to the playing field need to be widely discussed.

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

- 20 Sedley Taylor Road
- 23 Sedley Taylor Road
- 24 Sedley Taylor Road
- 26 Sedley Taylor Road
- 35 Sedley Taylor Road
- 2 Luard Road
- 27 Luard Road
- One representation was submitted by email

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Appearance and character of the proposal

- The design is generic and does not reflect the charm of the existing cricket pavilion;
- The proposed building is bigger, taller with a more solid roofline, and is located further into the playing fields than the existing pavilion which is subordinate to the open space;
- The choice of materials is unsympathetic and gives the impression of an industrial warehouse;

Trees

- The pavilion should not harm the health of any of the trees on the common boundary between Sedley Taylor Road and the applications site;

Drainage

- There was a drainage ditch, which has now been half filled in. The consequences of this need to be considered.

Neighbour amenity

- Increase in noise, especially when the showers are being used, which are located in close proximity to neighbouring properties;

- The proposed building will overshadow the neighbouring gardens in the evening;
- The site used to be open to the public, when it was not in use. Since the proposed development provides improved security of the building, restoring public access to the site might be one way of offsetting some of the nuisance caused by the development;

Crime and anti-social behaviour

- If the proposed pavilion is licensed to sell alcohol it will exacerbate existing problems that occur in Sedley Taylor Road and Luard Road, which are problems with theft, vandalism and unsociable behaviour;

Highways issues, traffic and cycle parking

- The proposed use would lead to an increase in traffic movements, in Sedley Taylor Road;
- The southern access road is narrow and drivers exiting the track onto Sedley Taylor Road cannot see oncoming pedestrians, it is not appropriate for regular vehicular access;
- The use of the northern access road on the corner of Luard and Sedley Taylor Road being used for construction traffic is dangerous with frequent accidents;
- The application does not provide sufficient details for constructors traffic and parking and with the parked cars and traffic calming methods, the roads are inappropriate for large construction vehicles;
- Construction and demolition traffic require management and as a minimum access hours should be restricted to prevent construction traffic at the same time as users;
- Provision needs to be made for the repair of the traffic calming measures in the likely event that they are damaged by construction traffic;

Car and Cycle parking

- With a 75% increase in floorspace, there is concern that as no provision for car parking has been made that illegal parking will continue and that there will be an increase in the requirement for parking;

- On Saturday's and Sundays when parking restrictions are not in place, it is common to find cars parked so that they partially block the entrances to properties on Sedley Taylor Road making it difficult to exit safely due to poor visibility;
- Insufficient provision on local streets for the accommodation of cars required for visiting teams from the county;
- Visiting teams will arrive by coach, which will be unable to enter the 10 foot track;
- Some matches generate the need for 60 – 80 car parking spaces as demonstrated through neighbours traffic surveys;
- For those more local members who may cycle to the ground, 20 cycle parking spaces is unreasonable for the number of persons who might be generated by several teams, together with officials and spectators;

Application process

- Procedural irregularities relating to the filling in of the application form with reference to question 18, inconsistencies as to whether the proposal will intensify the use of the site or not and that neighbour notification has been undertaken, which some neighbours have not received;
- The red line is only around the immediate area of the new sports pavilion, this line should extend around the building to be demolished too;
- Some sections of the planning application form were left blank and other sections filled in inadequately. This inadequacy was not corrected within the Design and Access Statement, which was not included in the documentation on Public Access but put up five days later after neighbours drew attention to it;
- Concern about neighbour consultation, which was undertaken by the College prior to the submission of the application;
- The planning application contained two contradictory dates for the return of neighbour comments due to the publication of a site notice and neighbour letters;
- There are questions as to the ownership of the Cantabrigian Rugby Club car park;

Other

- In order to retain this green space, it is important that it continues to serve its sporting purpose; hence it is not appropriate to suggest that the sport be curtailed due to lack of access. However, it must be the site operator's responsibility to manage the flow of traffic to avoid hazards and nuisance;
- The relocation of the existing pavilion is part of a strategy to provide land at the Homerton end of the field for a residential development that Homerton College and Hills Road Sixth Form College will both be party to.

7.4 A petition of 62 signatures has been submitted, stating that the signatories are opposed to the relocated pavilion because;

- Inadequate access and parking provision;
- Failure to site the pavilion without loss of sporting fields;
- Failure to provide adequate drainage;
- Does not propose a building which is 'iconic'
- Failure to protect neighbours and the area from noise, nuisance, loss of amenity and privacy and over development of an unsuitable area;
- Failure to address serious health and safety concerns; and
- Adds to foul sewerage and highway congestion problems.

7.5 The owners/occupiers of the following address has made a neutral representation:

- 41 Sedley Taylor Road

7.6 The representation can be summarised as follows:

- If demolition and building access will be via Long Road and there will be no on street parking and the mature trees can be protected, the proposal appears acceptable.

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. Context of site, design and external spaces
3. Trees and Wildlife
4. Archaeology
5. Drainage
6. Disabled access
7. Residential amenity
8. Refuse arrangements
9. Highway safety
10. Cycle parking
11. Third party representations

Principle of Development

8.2 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 and proposals for improvements will be supported providing that there would not be undue intrusion or significant adverse impact on the immediate locality or wider environment.

8.3 This application must, therefore, demonstrate that the proposed pavilion is appropriate to the surrounding area, and that it would improve the quality of the existing sports facility.

8.4 The applicants state that the existing pavilion, which was built in 1930 was built to meet the needs of the boys county high school. Throughout the years the pavilion has been remodelled and extended in accordance with the increasing demands of the facility, namely the need to provide girls and boys changing facilities. However, the pavilion can no longer be used practically as there is insufficient changing space to segregate males and females and because of the poor quality of the facilities. The uptake of the pitches for matches has therefore dropped significantly.

- 8.5 The applicants have undertaken a feasibility study, which examined the options of refurbishing the existing pavilion or building a new one. Given that the existing pavilion is located within the current cricket oval, any extension to the existing pavilion to provide appropriate facilities would exacerbate the existing problem of cricket balls hitting the pavilion. Furthermore, the option of relocating the cricket oval was investigated, but the rules of cricket state that players must be able to get to the crease within 2 minutes. Additionally, the existing pavilion is located close to the protected tree belt and the construction of an extension to the existing building would be severely limited due to the root protection area of the trees.
- 8.6 I am satisfied that this application appears to firmly enhance sporting provision in Cambridge by re-developing the existing facilities to provide improved 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. There is no intrinsic harm in the development of this existing sports site to meet contemporary requirements and this in fact is the most efficient and effective use of such sites.
- 8.7 Sport England has stated that they are supportive of the proposal which meets the exception test E2 of policy P1 in their guidance 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England' (1997). This exception is that the development is ancillary to the principle use of the site as a playing field and does not affect the quantity or quality of existing pitches, or adversely affect their use. The proposal is also in compliance with Sport England policy and wider government objectives to raise participation in sport and physical activity.
- 8.8 I consider the construction of a new pavilion is beneficial to this existing site, significantly enhancing the quality of facilities. As such, the development is considered acceptable, in principle, and is therefore in accordance with policy 6/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Context of site, design and external spaces

- 8.9 The site is very open and highly visible from Long Road bridge and to users of the London to Cambridge railway line. The area

is designated as Protected Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and development is not permitted where it may lead to harm upon the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance. Proposals, which respect the character of the area, improve amenity, improve sports facilities and increase public access will be supported.

- 8.10 Neighbours have expressed that the proposed development is not in character with the area as the pavilion is situated prominently on the playing field, which is at odds with the existing pavilion, which is situated close to the eastern boundary. I acknowledge that this is the case, but the root protection area of the protected trees are a significant constraint upon the proposal and it would be more favourable to retain the health of the trees and locate the pavilion more within the playing field as a consequence. Further to this opinion, the pavilion is an ancillary use to the playing field and is an integral building to its use and therefore, if it is more prominent, providing the appearance of the building is acceptable, this should not be viewed negatively.
- 8.11 The amended plans have reduced the length of the building from 44 m to 36 m, which in my opinion has created a building, which is more in proportion. The use of lighter colour timber also assists with improving and softening its appearance and removes the industrial appearance, which was associated with the building when black timber was proposed. Neighbours consider that the design is generic and doesn't reflect the charm of the existing pavilion. I appreciate these concerns, but the proposed design is more contemporary in appearance and although the use of more traditional features such as a clock tower may assist in softening the roofline of the proposed building, its such absence is not a fundamental shortcoming.
- 8.12 The side return of the building assists in securing the open-air storage area and rather than using 2.4 m high metal fencing as previously proposed, this element of the amended proposal helps to soften the appearance of the building, especially when traveling from Cambridge to London, as it will also be finished in natural timber.
- 8.13 In my opinion the proposal is a sensitive design although more prominent within the protected open space it does not detract

from the character of the area. The building form is simple and clean and the presence of a veranda will create some depth and shadow to the front of the building. Providing that a condition is imposed, which requires that once demolition of the existing pavilion is complete, the land will be reinstated as open space. I consider the proposal is acceptable and is compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/12 and 4/2.

Trees and Wildlife

- 8.14 The protected tree belt is along the length of the common boundary of the site with residential properties on Sedley Taylor Road and contains 33 trees, all of which have been surveyed in the submitted Arboriculture report. The report has identified the constraints of the site and acknowledges the need to create a temporary access road within the root protection area of tree number T33. The proposed demolition of the existing pavilion is being carried out close to tree numbers T14 and T18 and the build up of cement based dust is a consideration. The proposed new pavilion will be constructed outside of the root protection areas.
- 8.15 No tree removal is required, although the Tree Survey Schedule does recommend crown lifting a number of the trees in order to accommodate the construction vehicles. Access for a mobile crane could provide a significant logistical constraint due to the weight of the crane and the space required for manoeuvring. However, the construction exclusion zone will be in place around the root protection areas and as a result, this is a constraint that the constructors need to work within.
- 8.16 The City Council Arboriculture Officer is satisfied with the recommendations made in the report providing that any permission is conditioned so that works are carried out in accordance with the report.
- 8.17 There are concerns that there may be bats roosting within the roof void of the existing pavilion. It has been suggested that an external and internal inspection needs to be undertaken prior to the determination of the application. This inspection is presently taking place, during October, which is an satisfactory month to do so and the results of this investigation will be reported on the amendment sheet.

8.18 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 4/3 and 4/4.

Archaeology

8.19 Records indicate that the site is in an area of high archaeological potential and that recent excavations for the Southern Fringe and the Guided Bus have demonstrated the presence of established late prehistoric Roman settlements. The applicants have submitted an archaeology report, which was a desk-based assessment. However, the County Archaeologist has confirmed that a desk-based assessment is not required and that due to the recent discoveries, a programme of archaeological investigation needs to be undertaken and should be conditioned.

8.20 As case officer, I have questioned the requirement given the shallow foundations that will be required for this development. The County Archaeologist has confirmed that while any response would be tailored to the impact of the proposal, the condition should still be imposed.

8.21 In my opinion, subject to the imposition of a suitably worded condition, the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 4/9.

Drainage

8.22 The proposal seeks to separate foul and surface water and use an infiltration system for surface water, which should be satisfactory subject to infiltration testing.

8.23 With reference to foul water drainage an amended strategy has been received. It is proposed that given the frequency of use of the proposed facilities over the existing and that there will be an increase in peak flow rates, this will provide betterment over the existing situation in terms of self cleansing velocities. This approach is acceptable to the Sustainable Drainage Engineer.

8.24 However, relating to the surface water drainage, prior to the agreement of an infiltration system, there should be adequate ground investigations to back up this approach especially as no alternative drainage proposal has been discussed. These

investigations are presently occurring and the results will be forwarded onto the Sustainable Drainage Engineer. Any revised comments will be available on the amendment sheet.

- 8.25 In my opinion the proposal is in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/18.

Disabled access

- 8.26 As the changing rooms are only serving grass area sports then no provision for wheelchair users needs to be provided. The inclusion of an accessible toilet and shower is welcomed but the College may wish to fit this with additional fixtures in order to make it an official's room as well.
- 8.27 When finalising details it should be remembered that colour contrast is incorporated into the decoration scheme and that all toilet doors open inwards and have release catches as people can collapse after physical exercise.
- 8.28 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/7 and 3/12.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.29 The neighbouring properties, which are affected by the relocation of the proposed pavilion are those located on the western side of Sedley Taylor Road, whose gardens directly abut the playing fields. At present, the existing pavilion is located to the rear of 13, 14 and 15 Sedley Taylor Road. With the proposed relocation of the pavilion to the south, it will affect a new set of neighbours, namely 20, 21 and 22 Sedley Taylor Road.
- 8.30 On the rear elevation of the proposed building there are ventilation cowls within the roof slope, which are above the showers. However, there are no windows on this elevation even at high level, which may lead to a loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties, nor should there be any disturbance to these neighbours in terms of an increased level of noise from users of the pavilion as any noise will be directed out towards the playing field and the railway line beyond.

- 8.31 The application has proposed opening hours for the pavilion. However, it is not considered to be reasonable to impose conditions on the proposed pavilion, given that the existing is not subject to such restrictions. Neighbours are also concerned that in the future the College may wish to apply for a license to sell alcohol. The applicants have stated that this is not their intention.
- 8.32 There is concern from neighbours that there will be a loss of evening light to gardens due to the presence of the pavilion. I appreciate that the neighbours which will be affected by the new position of the building have until now enjoyed an undisturbed view onto the playing field. The proposed pavilion will be directly to the west of these gardens and therefore it will be late evening light that will be affected. However, given the mature tree belt, I do not believe that much light penetrates these trees during the summer months. I appreciate that these trees are deciduous, so afford less protection during the winter months, but, given the low height of the sun at this time of day, I believe that it will be behind the mature trees on the west side of the railway track and that the proposed pavilion will not significantly alter effect sunlight.
- 8.33 In terms of the wider area, concerns relating to parking both for contractors and users of the pavilion have caused great concern within the area due to the intensive use of Sedley Taylor Road and Luard Road by commuters, workmen, staff from Addenbrookes and students. The implications of highway safety due to on-street parking will be addressed separately.
- 8.34 It is proposed to use the northern access road for construction traffic in order to access the site and the contractors compound. The access road is large enough to accommodate contractor vehicles, yet narrow enough to limit vehicle speeds. Construction hours will be limited in order to protect neighbouring amenity and for the relatively short period of time it will take to construct the pavilion, I believe that this arrangement will not significantly impact upon the amenity of neighbours along this access road. A temporary track will also be constructed along the edge of the playing field, between the construction compound and the proposed pavilion site, but as this track will be approximately 60 m from the main dwellings, I do not consider that they will be disturbed significantly.

- 8.35 I do appreciate that Sedley Taylor Road and Luard Road are well used for on-street car parking by a variety of users and that users of the pavilion are likely to continue to add to this situation, but this would be no different to the existing situation. A high proportion of properties along these roads benefit from off-street car parking and are therefore not competing directly with on-street car parking spaces. I acknowledge that if junior matches are played, then it is likely that parents will wish to watch matches, which will lead to a higher volume of cars. At present, Sedley Taylor Road and Luard Road do not have parking restrictions on evenings and weekends. As a result, motorists are free to park on the roads during these times but will be in direct competition with other users. The College has investigated whether Long Road Sixth Form College would be willing to allow Hills Road Sixth Form to use their car park on evenings and weekends, when matches are played, but an agreement has not been forthcoming.
- 8.36 Some car parking will continue to be provided at the Cantabrigian Rugby Club, adjoining the site. I consider that greater management responsibility needs to be exercised by the college with regards to car parking in order to limit its impact upon the neighbouring community as visiting teams are likely to arrive by minibus or small coach. It is not appropriate to seek to rectify what is clearly an existing problem through this application, however the College should consider introducing a traffic management plan incorporating the use of marshals, to assist in reducing the negative impact of cars upon the residents.
- 8.37 The demolition of the existing pavilion and control of dust will be addressed through appropriate conditions relating to strategies and hours of demolition in order to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 8.38 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 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4 and 3/7.

Highway Safety

- 8.39 Residents have concerns regarding the proposals and use of the two access roads upon highway safety.
- 8.40 The Highway Engineer recommended the use of the northern access road by construction traffic as there was improved visibility for vehicles leaving the site providing that a condition was attached requiring a construction traffic management plan prior to the commencement of demolition or development. This plan would need to address the movement and control of muck away lorries, contractor car parking, movements and control of all deliveries, including hours of delivery that should be outside of morning and evening rush /school hours. Further to this, I consider that a banksman should be used to ensure safe egress and ingress from the access road onto the public highway. The Highway Engineer is in agreement with this approach.
- 8.41 The use of the southern access road does not fall within the application site. I am well aware of the existing problems pertaining to this access road and do not dispute that it is extremely narrow, to the point where a car cannot pass a pedestrian or cyclist, nor can two cars pass each other. It would not be reasonable of the council to try and rectify what are existing issues, outside of the application site, through this proposal. The application is for a replacement pavilion, albeit with an enlarged floor area to provide the improved facilities. No new facility has been added and as a result, it is not reasonable to argue that the proposal significantly worsens the existing problem.
- 8.42 A neighbour has undertaken their own traffic assessment, which has been considered by the Highway Authority. However, the evidence gathered relates to existing problems associated mainly with the link formed by Sedley Taylor Road/Luard Road from Long Road to Hills Road. These are existing issues which the application to replace the pavilion will neither resolve nor, in planning terms, make materially worse. Additionally, local residents consider that an independent traffic assessment is required. It is my view that it would be unreasonable to request such an assessment on the basis that the use of the proposed pavilion does not alter from the existing.

- 8.43 I have considered the most recent appeal decision on a parcel of land to the rear of 23 Sedley Taylor Road, which related to planning reference 05/0028/S73, which was for an extension of time of a previous permission C/99/0562/OP, which was for the construction of a single dwellinghouse.
- 8.44 In this appeal decision, the Inspector does conclude that given the narrow access of the road, the proposal would intensify the potential of conflicting vehicle and pedestrian movements on the access road leading to unsafe conditions, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists. This application was for a new dwelling creating new movements through this access road. The application for a replacement pavilion does not propose any new uses within the pavilion and seeks to only improve the existing facilities. Parallels cannot therefore be drawn between the reasoning to resist the new dwelling and the replacement pavilion. The southern access road is not within the application site area as no changes are proposed and therefore consideration cannot be given any further to the use of this access road and its existing problems, nor can conditions be attached.
- 8.45 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/2.

Cycle Parking

- 8.46 The existing pavilion has 20 cycle parking spaces located at the eastern boundary, close to the northern access road. This is because students of Hills Road Sixth Form use this access road as pedestrian and cycle access to the site. The retention of the existing 20 cycle parking spaces are proposed for the new pavilion and this is in accordance with adopted standards.
- 8.47 However, while some cycle parking in the existing location is useful, as users of the pavilion do not then need to push their bikes across the edge of the playing field, I do consider that some should also be provided near to the proposed pavilion. In order to ensure that a sufficient level of provision is provided, I consider that it is appropriate to impose a condition requiring further racks.

8.48 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with East of England Plan (2008) policy T9 and Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policy 8/6.

Third Party Representations

8.49 The majority of objections have been addressed within the main report, although there remain some outstanding. These are addressed below.

8.50 The restoration of public access onto the site is a matter for the College to consider as the land is private property.

8.51 The recommendation that provision needs to be made for any damage to traffic calming measures is beyond the remit of the local planning authority and in the event that such damage does occur, it would be for the Highway Authority to follow up as it is their property.

8.52 While I appreciate that the original question 18 within the application form was incorrect, this was picked up at validation stage where an amended copy of question 18 was submitted on its own. This was published on Public Access separately to the main planning application form but was available from the start of the application.

8.53 With the amended design of the proposed pavilion an amended site location plan was submitted which correctly outlined the application site, including the existing pavilion and contractors compound and access.

8.54 There was a small delay in getting the Design and Access Statement published on Public Access, for which I apologised and rectified the situation.

8.55 Applicants are not required to undertake neighbour consultation prior to the submission of an application. In this instance the College did but the logistics of how this was carried out are not for the scrutiny of the local planning authority. The planning application itself did in have two dates for neighbour comments. One was generated by the letter sent to neighbours which specified the latest dates was 1st September, while the site notice extended this date to 9th September. I appreciate that this was a little confusing, but I confirmed that neighbours

had until 9th September to comment and the facility for public comments remained open until this time on Public Access. It is not standard practice to send out a second letter to clarify this situation to neighbours.

- 8.56 The opinion of some residents is that the proposed relocation of the existing pavilion is a strategy to provide land at the Homerton College end of the field, for a residential development, this has been disputed by the applicant.

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. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the external surfaces is appropriate. (East of England Plan 2008 policy ENV7 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 3/4, 3/12 and 3/14)

3. Except with the prior written agreement of the local planning authority in writing no construction work or demolition shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday, 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

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

4. Except with the prior agreement of the local planning authority in writing, there should be no collection or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the hours of 0700 hrs and 1800 hrs on Monday - Friday, 0800 hrs and 1300 hrs Saturday and there should be no collections or deliveries on Sundays or Bank and public holidays. In addition, there shall be no collection or deliveries between 0730 and 0900, and 1500 to 1630 Monday to Friday.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties and in the interests of highway safety. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies 4/13 and 8/2)

5. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a construction traffic management plan has been agreed with the Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:
 - i. Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
 - ii. Contractor parking should be within the curtilage of the site and not on street.
 - iii. Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading should be undertaken off the adopted public highway)
 - iv. The requirement of a trained banksman to assist all lorries with egress and ingress from the site onto the public highway.

Thereafter, there shall be no variation or amendment to the approved Traffic Management Plan unless formally agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

6. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details of the following matters for that phase shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.
 - i) contractors access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel,
 - ii) contractors site storage area/compound,

- iii) the means of moving, storing and stacking all building materials, plant and equipment around and adjacent to the site,
- iv) the arrangements for parking of contractors vehicles and contractors personnel vehicles.

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

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

- 7. No development shall take place until a programmed of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust from the site during the construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

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

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

- 9. No development shall commence until a detailed scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage in accordance with the submitted Drainage Strategy and Flood Risk Assessment by WSP dated 20th February 2009, reference 11012117 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage works shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development.

Reason: In order to ensure adequate means of surface water drainage

(Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 policy P1/3 and Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/18).

10. Development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report by Acacia Tree Surgery Limited, prepared by Cliff Freed and dated 20th July 2011.

Reason: In order to protect the tree belt (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/4).

11. Prior to commencement of use of the development hereby approved, Rugby Pitch 1 shall be satisfactorily re-configured as indicated on submitted drawing ref: 11530/(0)01/P2 and thereafter maintained as such unless the prior approval of the local planning authority is obtained.

Reason: To ensure existing sports pitch provision on the site is maintained following the completion of the development hereby approved, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/2).

12. Within six months of the completion of the development approved under this planning permission, the existing pavilion shall be demolished and the land reinstated to playing field in accordance with a restoration scheme to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the site of the existing pavilion is satisfactorily reinstated to playing field use, in the interests of overall sports pitch provision on this site, in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 4/2).

13. Prior to occupation of the approved pavilion details of facilities for the secure parking of 30 bicycles for use in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before use of the development commences.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision for the secure storage of bicycles. (Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policy 8/6)

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised to contact Mark Taylor, Cambridge City Council Access Officer to discuss requirements for disabled spectators further.

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: SS1, T9, T14, ENV7

Cambridge Local Plan (2006):

3/1,3/4,3/7,3/12,4/2,4/3,4/4,4/9,6/2,8/2,8/6,8/10,8/18

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 papers” 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.