

<b>Application Ref:</b>	16/00590/FUL
<b>Proposal:</b>	Proposed extensions to create new administration accommodation with theatre suite over with plant room in roof and associated link corridor, new first floor level modular construction theatre store and new single storey waiting area. Various internal remodelling works to restaurant, physiotherapy department and main reception waiting accommodation. External works to create additional parking bays
<b>Site:</b>	Fitzwilliam Hospital, Milton Way, Bretton, Peterborough
<b>Applicant:</b>	Ramsay Health Care UK Ltd
<b>Agent:</b>	Hall Needham Associates LLP
<b>Referred by:</b>	Councillor Coles
<b>Reason:</b>	Impact upon neighbour amenity, overdevelopment and parking issues
<b>Site visit:</b>	21.04.2016
<b>Case officer:</b>	Miss Louise Lovegrove
<b>Telephone No.</b>	01733 454439
<b>E-Mail:</b>	<a href="mailto:louise.lovegrove@peterborough.gov.uk">louise.lovegrove@peterborough.gov.uk</a>
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>GRANT</b> subject to relevant conditions

## 1 Description of the site and surroundings and Summary of the proposal

### Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises the Fitzwilliam Hospital, a well-established private hospital. It is located within a predominantly residential area, with the site bound to the north, east and west by residential dwellings. To the south, the site is bound by Milton Park (included in the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest) and the associated Grade I Listed Building of Milton Hall.

The building within the site is largely single storey in height albeit there are some two and three storey elements to the south-eastern elevation. It is set back within the site, located centrally with car parking to the north, east and west. There is some soft landscaping around the site boundaries comprising a mixture of mature hedging and semi-mature trees albeit the southern boundary is formed by a mature tree belt. It should be noted that the application site is subject to a considerable change in levels, with the slope running from north to south.

### Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for:

- the construction of a new three storey extension to the south-eastern elevation to form a new theatre suite at first floor with administrative office and 3no. consulting rooms at ground floor;
- the construction of a first floor modular extension within the internal courtyard of the building to provide a theatre store;
- the construction of a single storey extension to the south-eastern elevation to create an extended waiting room to the main entrance; and
- the creation of 18no. new parking spaces through additional hardstanding and consolidation of existing parking spaces.

It should be noted that the current application follows from the withdrawal of an identical application from 2015. This earlier application was withdrawn at the request of Officers to enable the

submission of additional traffic and parking information.

## 2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
P0382/86	Single storey extension for physiotherapy department	Permitted	12/06/1986
P0001/87	Erection of extensions, layout of additional car parking and landscaping	Permitted	19/02/1987
P1582/88	Single and two storey extensions and car park	Permitted	20/04/1989
99/00856/FUL	Use of grassland as car parking areas	Permitted	17/09/1999
02/00862/FUL	Single storey extension to create six offices	Permitted	12/08/2002
08/00845/FUL	Single storey entrance lobby to endoscopy suite	Permitted	25/09/2008
09/00237/FUL	Additional car parking and re siting of clinical waste and bin store area	Permitted	25/06/2009
09/00823/FUL	Single storey extension to south corner of existing hospital for enlarged reception and waiting area, retaining the MRI scanner in its original location (Revised Application)	Permitted	02/10/2009
09/01183/FUL	Single storey extension to south corner of existing hospital for enlarged reception and waiting area, and ramped link to car park (revisions to previous approval of application 09/00823/FUL)	Permitted	24/11/2009
10/00533/FUL	Construction of 3 storey administration/theatre extension, single storey radiology/MRI suite extension and other minor works	Withdrawn by Applicant	15/06/2010
10/00952/FUL	Proposed 3 storey administration/theatre recovery extension and single storey radiology extension and other minor works	Permitted	05/11/2010
11/00083/FUL	First floor prefabricated portacabin linking to existing building and revised location for previously approved cycle shelter (10/00952/FUL)	Permitted	23/02/2011
11/01680/FUL	Additional plant compound to undercroft of new 3 storey extension, minor window re-position on theatre extension, minor revisions to roof of new extension (retrospective), enhanced noise attenuation measures to existing plant	Permitted	02/03/2012
12/01366/FUL	Construction of single storey extension to provide MRI suite including link corridor to adjoining Radiology Department	Permitted	04/02/2013
13/01709/WCPP	Variation of Condition 2 (Approved plans) of Planning Permission 12/01366/FUL - Construction of single storey extension to provide MRI suite including link corridor to adjoining Radiology Department	Permitted	09/01/2014
15/00483/FUL	Additional car parking and rationalisation of some existing parking areas	Permitted	18/05/2015

15/01860/FUL      New modular theatre, link and plant compound under including disabled car parking spaces      Withdrawn by Applicant      18/12/2015

### **3 Planning Policy**

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

#### **Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**

##### **Section 66 - General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions**

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

#### **National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**

##### **Section 8 - Social, Cultural and Recreational Facilities**

Developments should plan for the provision and use of shared space, community services and other local services; guard against the unnecessary loss of valued services/facilities; allow established shops, facilities and services to develop/modernise; and ensure an integrated approach to the location of housing, economic uses and communities facilities and services.

##### **Section 11 - Noise**

New development giving rise to unacceptable adverse noise impacts should be resisted; development should mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising. Development often creates some noise and existing businesses wanting to expand should not be unreasonably restricted because of changes in nearby land uses.

##### **Section 4 - Assessment of Transport Implications**

Development which generates a significant amount of traffic should be supported by a Transport Statement/Transport Assessment. It should be located to minimise the need to travel/to maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel and be supported by a Travel Plan. Large scale developments should include a mix of uses. A safe and suitable access should be provided and the transport network improved to mitigate the impact of the development.

##### **Section 12 - Conservation of Heritage Assets**

Account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining/enhancing heritage assets; the positive contribution that they can make to sustainable communities including economic viability; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of a new development great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Planning permission should be refused for development which would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance unless this is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh the harm/loss. In such cases all reasonable steps should be taken to ensure the new development will proceed after the harm/ loss has occurred.

#### **Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)**

##### **CS14 - Transport**

Promotes a reduction in the need to travel, sustainable transport, the Council's UK Environment Capital aspirations and development which would improve the quality of environments for residents.

### **CS16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm**

Design should be of high quality, appropriate to the site and area, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, be accessible to all users and not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

### **CS17 - The Historic Environment**

Development should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment including non-scheduled nationally important features and buildings of local importance.

## **Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)**

### **PP02 - Design Quality**

Permission will only be granted for development which makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment; does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area; is sufficiently robust to withstand/adapt to climate change; and is designed for longevity.

### **PP03 - Impacts of New Development**

Permission will not be granted for development which would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, public and/or private green space or natural daylight; be overbearing or cause noise or other disturbance, odour or other pollution; fail to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder.

### **PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access by all user groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including highway safety.

### **PP13 - Parking Standards**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

### **PP16 - The Landscaping and Biodiversity Implications of Development**

Permission will only be granted for development which makes provision for the retention of trees and natural features which contribute significantly to the local landscape or biodiversity.

### **PP17 - Heritage Assets**

Development which would affect a heritage asset will be required to preserve and enhance the significance of the asset or its setting. Development which would have detrimental impact will be refused unless there are overriding public benefits.

## **Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Preliminary Draft)**

This document sets out the planning policies against which development will be assessed. It will bring together all the current Development Plan Documents into a single document. Consultation on this document runs from 15 January to 25 February 2016.

At this preliminary stage the policies cannot be afforded any weight with the exception of the calculation relating to the five year land supply as this is based upon the updated Housing Needs Assessment and sites which have planning permission or which are subject to a current application. Individual policies are not therefore referred to further in this report.

## **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010**

### **Paragraphs 203-205 of the National Planning Policy Framework: Planning Conditions and Obligations:**

Requests for planning obligations whether CIL is in place or not, are only lawful where they meet the following tests:-

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and

- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

In addition obligations should be:

- (i) relevant to planning;
- (ii) reasonable in all other respects.

Planning permissions may not be bought or sold. Unacceptable development cannot be permitted because of benefits/inducements offered by a developer which are not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Neither can obligations be used purely as a means of securing for the local community a share in the profits of development.

#### **4 Consultations/Representations**

##### **PCC Tree Officer (25.04.16)**

No objections - With regards to the additional parking spaces proposed, tree loss is likely to be minimal and restricted to one or two low value trees. The principal trees affected by the proposed extension are 4no. young Silver Birch. The submitted drawings identify the planting of 4no. new trees of the same species. Such planting should be secured by condition, with a 5 year establishment also secured.

##### **The Woodland Trust**

No comments received.

##### **Forestry Commission**

No comments received.

##### **PCC Pollution Team (08.06.16)**

No objections – Request a condition which limits the level of noise at the nearest dwelling to 30dBA during daytime and 26dBA at night-time.

##### **Environment Agency (06.04.16)**

No objections - The proposal has been assessed as having a relatively low environmental risk.

##### **Garden History Society - Milton Park**

No comments received.

##### **Historic England**

No comments received.

##### **Cambridgeshire Gardens Trust**

No comments received.

##### **PCC Conservation Officer (28.04.16)**

No objections - Whilst the height of the proposal is marginally taller than the ridge of the main building, given its location and the landscape buffer to the west, it is considered that the development will not harm the character or setting of Milton Hall or Milton Park. It is suggested that the Landscape Officer is asked whether additional boundary planting would assist in reinforcing that buffer screening.

##### **Bretton Parish Council (14.04.16)**

No objections - However the following comments are raised:

1. It seems that since the first plan was submitted in November 2015, a few trees have been removed to make way for the extra car parking spaces.
2. In the car parking demand study, it states that "the staff travel survey (September 2015) identified 62% of staff drive to work" but this assumes that all new staff will drive to work.
3. Always erring on the up-side means that there is over-provision. If parking is too easy, there is

less inducement not to drive and so does not follow the transport plan.

**PCC Wildlife Officer (15.04.16)**

No objections - Whilst the site lies in close proximity to Milton Park County Wildlife Site, the proposal is unlikely to have an impact upon features for which this site has been designated. The proposal does however involve the removal of vegetation which may support nesting birds. An informative should be placed on any decision advising of the need to ensure no wild nesting birds are disturbed during the nesting season. In terms of the proposed replacement planting, the species submitted appear acceptable and would ensure no net loss in biodiversity results.

**The Wildlife Trusts (Cambridgeshire) (08.04.16)**

No comments.

**Natural England - Consultation Service (06.04.16)**

No comments.

**PCC Transport & Engineering Services (06.06.16)**

No objections – The contents of the submitted Car Parking Demand Survey are accepted and it is considered that the proposal would provide adequate parking to meet the demands of the new development. There is little scope for additional further development and it is requested that a review of on-site parking conditions take place after a period of 12 months. Should this review highlight an overspill of parked vehicles on the adjacent public highway, the Applicant may be liable for the implementation of parking restrictions.

**Local Residents/Interested Parties**

Initial consultations: 20

Total number of responses: 13

Total number of objections: 7

Total number in support: 0

6no. objections have been received from local residents on the following grounds:

- In principle, the new City Hospital should provide everything needed for the area served. This asks the strategic question, which you as planners should be asking: why does the City Hospital need 'public' services from this private sector operator? It does not make sense.
- The proposed administrative and theatre suite are of three storey construction, to which we (occupant of Robin Hood Close) have previously objected. The adjacent residential estate is based upon two storeys, as was the original hospital. If a developer were to purchase a property and seek to re-build three storey apartments, no doubt it would be refused. This application should also be refused on those grounds.
- The proposed administrative and theatre suite will project beyond the existing building line on the south-east elevation and the extension is therefore closer to our property (Robin Hood Close). There seems to be no reason by the staircase in this projection should not all be constructed within the existing building line in a straight configuration, rather than parallel, which pushes it outside the building line and closer to us.
- Part of the south-eastern extension is faced in matching brickwork whilst the staircase is clad in Western Cedar, altogether cheap and out of character. We shall see it everyday (Robin Hood Close).
- Another extension to the hospital will need more car parking for the extra staff and visitors. At present, even with recent additions, the accommodation for car parking is insufficient and there are many occasions when cars have been parked along Milton Way, on grass verges and down Robin Hood Close. The last extension made no provision for sufficient additional parking and this proposal shall presumably go in some way to meeting the need but probably not far enough.
- Whilst the proposal seeks to provide more car parking for the hospital site, this is inadequate and further development will exacerbate the existing situation.
- The roads surrounding the site are not suitable for parking because of the residential nature of

the estate. From personal observations, the safety of other road users and pedestrians is compromised.

- If this application is approved, it should be stated that the parking of cars is restricted only to the hospital grounds.
- The proposed plant room is of concern as no doubt there will be noise emanating from the building. There does not appear to be any consideration for this because the submitted Noise Report is 4 years out of date. If there is going to be noise from the plant, this will have further implications for residents of Nos.6 and 8 Robin Hood Close who are already plagued by noise from the existing plant.
- The changes to the hospital, including the proposal, have resulted in an industrial complex, out of keeping with the locality. This is development too far.
- Where does it end? Will the hospital keep building higher and higher, and increase our stress levels with a construction that is a predominate feature at the back of our homes (Robin Hood Close) bringing additional noise and activity.

In addition, 4no. representations have been submitted neither objecting to nor supporting the proposal. They have however raised the following points/queries:

- Residents of Milton Way are concerned at the increase in traffic over the past few years, mainly caused by the increase in patients attending the hospital. The traffic survey undertaken does not appear to give the whole picture. Thursday's appear to be the busiest days, with traffic parking in the road and on grass verges. A further survey on this day would be appreciated, and would give a better idea of the problems that residents face.
- There are concerns that the proposal would generate additional traffic that would end up parked on the street.
- Better traffic signage entering and leaving the car park would help direct drivers in the right direction. 'Dead-end' signage should be used on the lamppost after the turn to Sebrights Way, which was removed after the street lighting was renewed. A sign would help deter traffic from having the use the cul-de-sac.
- We would hope that the proposed large extension would not set a precedent for further large-scale second floor extensions.
- The hospital must be nearing its maximum size.
- Insufficient public consultation has taken place which makes me wonder whether these applications are pushed through as silently as possible.
- The proposed new 12no. parking spaces to the front of the building are in an area routinely occupied by the mobile MRI scanner. Where will this vehicle be parked in future once the spaces are in operation?
- The key on the proposed plans refer to 'rationalised gravel parking spaces' but these do not appear to be shown?

**Councillor Coles** (comments submitted as Ward Councillor prior to the election) - I wish to support the objections raised by local residents who are concerned about the additional development on the hospital site. In summary, my objections are:

1. The additional extension will be an unacceptable intrusion into the character of the local area, which is otherwise entirely residential. The additional height of the extension will risk private back gardens being overlooked, to the detriment of the occupants enjoyment of their privacy. I am told that previous plans to build to three storeys were refused.
2. The proposed use of timber on the outside of the building is out of character with the current building and surrounding properties.
3. There is already some sound intrusion from plant on the site which causes a disturbance to residents and has not been adequately ameliorated. The additional plant room is likely to increase the sound pollution to local houses.
4. The plan proposes some additional parking but the current reality is that parking regularly overflows from the hospital site into local streets. Any growth will inevitably bring further traffic congestion to the area. The local public transport service is inadequate to meet the transport needs of users and there is insufficient space within the site to increase parking to meet current demand, let alone demand following further building.

5. The hospital was originally a small private facility that local residents supported. Since then, the nature of the hospital has increased beyond reasonable expectations with growth largely resulting from NHS patients with elective surgery undertaken through contracted-out services. The new PDH site has unused operating facilities on the top floor. If these were brought into use, this would be a far more sustainable use of resources than using the application site.

## **5 Assessment of the planning issues**

The main considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Parking and highway implications
- Neighbour amenity
- Impact upon designated heritage assets
- Trees

### **a) Principle of development**

Paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) places significant weight on the need for planning decisions to plan positively for the provision of local services to enhance the sustainability of communities. The proposal seeks to expand the services and facilities of Fitzwilliam Hospital through the provision of a new theatre suite with associated consulting rooms, administrative office, storage and plant room. The proposal would therefore increase the provision of healthcare facilities on the site, serving the needs of the wider community. Whilst it is noted that the application site is a private hospital, it provides services for all users of the National Health Service through the undertaking of elective surgery. On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would represent a community benefit through increased healthcare services.

It is noted that objections have been received with regards to the lack of need for the proposal owing to the unused facilities at the nearby Peterborough District Hospital (PDH) site. Furthermore, there are concerns that the proposal should be refused owing to the lack of strategic overview of healthcare services, which should all be provided at the PDH site. These concerns are noted however the structure for providing healthcare facilities is not a material planning consideration and therefore cannot be taken into account.

### **b) Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area**

The proposal seeks the construction of three separate extensions to the existing hospital buildings. The largest of these is the proposed three storey extension to the south-eastern elevation which would provide a new theatre suite, consulting rooms, administrative office and plant room. This element of the proposal would extend to a maximum height of 11.5 metres to ridge and be sited to the southern edge of an existing two and three storey part of the building. The proposal would project beyond the facing elevation of the existing building by approximately 1.6 metres by virtue of the proposed projecting gable which would contain the stairwell to the extension. The facing elevations of this extension would be blank, with no facing windows. Furthermore, it is proposed for the external walls to be finished in matching brick and roof tiles with the exception of the projecting gable, which is proposed to be finished in vertical cedar cladding.

It is considered that the design, size and height of this extension both respects and reflects the character and appearance of the host building. There has been some objection from local residents expressing concern with regards to the scale of the proposal and its intended materials. However, the overall height and massing of the proposal would mirror a similar extension to the same elevation which was granted permission under application reference 10/00925/FUL. It is not considered that the proposal or resultant building as a whole would appear unduly dominant or obtrusive, and would not unacceptably harm the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area.



With regards to the proposed first floor modular extension, this would be fully enclosed within an existing courtyard which is situated centrally within the confines of the existing building. Accordingly, it would not be visible from the public realm and would therefore not have any impact upon the character and appearance of the locality.

In terms of the proposed single storey extension, it is considered that this represents a natural extension to the existing building. The proposal is intended to be of fully glazed design, continuing the same elevation treatment as the existing entrance adjacent to which it would be sited. The extension would effectively create a larger entrance atrium to the hospital, maintaining the proportions and height of the existing. Accordingly, it is considered that this would not materially alter the overall appearance of the site.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact to the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area and is therefore in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

**c) Parking and highway implications**

All of the objections received from local residents, including the former Ward Councillor, have expressed concerns with regards to the level of parking provided within the site and on-street parking congestion which results from the existing hospital. These concerns are noted and it is acknowledged that at peak times there is considerable overspill parking on the surrounding residential street of Milton Way in particular. However, the planning system can only require new development to mitigate the impacts that it would generate and as such, only the parking impact of the current proposal may be considered and addressed as part of this application.

The proposal would principally result in the construction of a new operating theatre, with the other facilities all considered to be ancillary to this. Initially, the Local Highway Authority (LHA) were concerned that there would be insufficient on-site parking facilities to accommodate the additional patient and staff parking demand generated. In response to this, a Car Parking Demand Survey was undertaken which predicts future parking demand generated by the additional theatre. The predictions are based upon historical trends, developments and assessment of current referral rates according to different specialities. This survey forecasts that the new operating theatre and associated facilities would generate a maximum additional parking demand of between 153 and 176 spaces (in combination with the demand generated by the existing hospital). The LHA has accepted this prediction as the methodology and data used to compile it are considered robust.

The proposal seeks to provide a total number of 184 parking spaces, which includes the consolidation of some existing parking areas to increase provision, and new hardstanding to create additional spaces. At present, the site has a total of 157 parking spaces and therefore, the proposal seeks an increase of 27 spaces. Based upon the Car Parking Demand Survey, the LHA has raised no objections to the proposal and considers that this level of parking would be sufficient. However, the LHA has also highlighted that there is very little scope for further development on the site and that the level of proposed parking would only just, in their opinion, cover the predicted future demand. As such, there is a request that the Developer be required to undertake a review of on and off-site parking conditions both before construction of the development and after a period of 12 months following first use of the new theatre. This review would be intended to assess whether any unacceptable levels of on-street parking were taking place above and beyond existing levels and, in such an event of increased dangerous parking, there would be a requirement for the imposition of parking restrictions (in the form of a Traffic Regulation Order) within the surrounding residential streets. As this requires a potential financial contribution, the only means through which this could be secured are within a Section 106 legal agreement. This would be secured following the Committee Meeting in the event that Member's resolve to approve the application.

It is noted that a query has been raised with regards to the current siting of a mobile CT

scanner vehicle within the area to the front of the main building which is intended to create additional parking spaces. The Applicant has confirmed that it is intended for this vehicle to continue to visit the site on a twice weekly basis and that it would continue to be sited in the same location. This would therefore occupy up to 7 spaces and, twice weekly, reduce the level of parking provision within the site to 177 spaces. However, this would still broadly meet with the predicted parking demand. It is therefore considered that this would not unacceptably reduce the level of parking provision within the site and the proposal would still meet the parking demands generated.

During the period of construction, there is some concern with regards to the position and siting of the construction compound/contractor parking and the impact that this may have upon the parking available for staff, patients and visitors. As such, it is considered necessary to impose a condition requiring the submission of a detailed Construction Management Plan which will need to be adhered to throughout the period of construction.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the parking demand generated by the proposal would be met and, subject to review, no undue demand for parking off-site would result. The proposal would therefore not pose an unacceptable danger to highway safety and is in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

**d) Neighbour amenity**

With regards to the proposed three storey extension to the south-eastern elevation, it is noted that objections have been received from neighbouring occupants along Robin Hood Close in terms of the impact of the proposal upon their amenity. The principal concerns relate to overbearing, loss of privacy and noise impacts.

In terms of the physical relationship of the proposal, this would be sited approximately 21.4 metres from the closest boundary with a residential dwelling (No.10 Robin Hood Close) and 34 metres from the facing rear elevation of this dwelling. It is considered that this level of separation is adequate to ensure that no undue levels of overbearing impact result. Furthermore, it should be noted that the same elevation was permitted an extension of the same scale and height in 2010 (reference 10/00952/FUL). The separation distance from this permitted and constructed extension to the nearest residential boundary and dwelling (No.6 Robin Hood Close) is 16.4 and 31 metres respectively. The proposal therefore represents a greater level of separation than the earlier extension.

In terms of noise impact, there are two different impacts which would result: noise and general disturbance relating to increased activity on the site; and noise from the proposed plant room. In terms of increased activity on the site, it is not considered that the addition of a new theatre suite (with other associated facilities) would significantly increase the intensity of the use of the site. It is acknowledged that the surrounding area is residential, and residents have expressed concerns that past extensions have resulted in an industrial development which jars with the character of the locality. Concern is expressed that the proposal would only exacerbate this disharmony with the surrounding area. However, the existing hospital is well-established and does not appear an unduly prominent or dominant feature within the locality. Whilst it is a large facility, catering for a wide range of patients, it is not considered that the additional development proposed would unacceptably intensify the activity of the site and any increase is likely to be imperceptible above and beyond existing levels. Furthermore, the level of activity would be relatively dispersed throughout the site, as the additional parking provision (and associated noise from vehicles) is not concentrated in any one area which does not already have parking there.

With regards to noise from plant, it is noted that concern has been raised from residents of Robin Hood Close that the additional proposed plant room would result in further noise disturbance above and beyond that which already exists. The City Council's Pollution Control Officer has advised that there have been no statutory noise complaints received in relation to

existing plant at the site and as such, there is no way to verify the comments raised. However, due consideration must be given to the need to ensure that any new plant does not create an unacceptable noise disturbance. The Pollution Control Officer has advised that a condition be imposed which restricts the noise emitted from the site in relation to the levels at adjacent residential properties. Over the years, differing noise limit conditions have been imposed on planning permissions however the Pollution Control Officer has advised that the lowest of the limits imposed (which was last imposed in 2012) should be re-used to ensure that the level of noise is not perceptible above background levels. Accordingly, a noise limit of 30dBA during daytime (07:00 to 23:00 hours) and 26dBA during night-time (23:00 to 07:00 hours) is to be imposed by condition. These levels are considered acceptable in the context of the site, which has a relatively high background noise level owing to the traffic noise from the nearby A47 Trunk Road.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact to the amenities of neighbouring occupants and is therefore in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

**e) Impact upon designated heritage assets**

The southern boundary of the application site bounds the registered historic parkland/gardens of the Milton Estate, with the Grade I Listed Milton Hall approximately 1,200 metres beyond. Under the provisions of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as national and local planning policies, special regard must be paid to the need to ensure that the historic features of these heritage assets are preserved or enhanced.

The City Council's Conservation Officer has advised that whilst the proposed extension would be set marginally higher than the existing building, given its siting set-back within the site and the considerable intervening landscape buffer along the site boundary, the proposal would not harm the character or setting of Milton Hall or Park. The Conservation Officer has however requested that consideration be given to whether additional boundary planting would assist in reinforcing the buffer screen. This is discussed below.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would preserve the character and setting of designated heritage assets and as such, the proposal is in accordance with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

**f) Trees**

As detailed within Section 1 above, there are both trees contained within and surrounding the application site of varying degrees of maturity. By virtue of the proposed extension and additional parking spaces, some of the trees within the site would need to be felled, in particular 4no. Silver Birch trees. The City Council's Tree Officer has raised no objections to this as the trees offer little contribution towards the overall amenity of the locality and public views of the trees are relatively limited. Notwithstanding this, the proposal seeks to re-plant 4no. Silver Birch trees within the area surrounding the extension including opposite the extension along the boundary with Robin Hood Close. This re-planting is considered to be appropriate and would mitigate the loss of the existing trees.

It is noted that the Conservation Officer has requested that the planting to the southern boundary with Milton Estate be reviewed, and additional strengthening through new planting be sought if considered appropriate. However, the planning system can only require works to mitigate the impacts of the development subject to the application. Given that no harm has been identified to the setting of the heritage assets which lie to the south, it is not considered reasonable or necessary to require additional strengthening planting of this boundary.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal would not result in the loss of any trees

of key amenity value and adequate replacement planting can be secured. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

## 6 Conclusions

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal is acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- the proposal would result in additional healthcare facilities and services which would be of benefit to the community of Peterborough, in accordance with paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012);
- the proposed extensions and car park reconfiguration would not result in an unacceptable impact upon the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would provide adequate on-site parking facilities to meet the demands of the proposal and, in the event that increased on-street parking results in a danger to highway safety, adequate measures can be implemented to address this, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would preserve the character and setting of nearby designated heritage assets, in accordance with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012); and
- the proposal would not result in the loss of trees which are of key amenity value to the locality and adequate mitigating planting can be secured, in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

## 7 Recommendation

The Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions and the securing of a Section 106 Legal Agreement which makes provision for pre- and post-occupation parking surveys of the surrounding residential streets and, where necessary, the implementation of Traffic Regulation Orders on those streets.

If the required Section 106 legal agreement is not completed within a reasonable period, then the Committee delegates the issuing of a notice of refusal to the Director of Growth and Regeneration on the grounds that the development has failed to adequately mitigate its impacts.

C 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

C 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:

- Location Plan (drawing number 6593/LP2 Revision A)
- Site Survey (drawing number 7829 Sheet 1 Revision A)
- Site Plan as Existing (drawing number 6593/P10)
- Ground Floor Plan as Existing (drawing number 6593/P11)
- First and Part Second Floor Plan as Existing (drawing number 6593/P12)

- Elevations as Existing - Sheet 1 of 2 (drawing number 6593/P13)
- Elevations as Existing - Sheet 2 of 2 (drawing number 6593/P14)
- Proposed Site Layout (drawing number 6593 P.20 Revision C)
- Proposed Ground Floor GA (drawing number 6593 P.21 Revision C)
- Proposed First Floor GA and Plant Room Over (drawing number 6593 P.22)
- Proposed Elevations (drawing number 6593 P.23)
- Proposed North Courtyard Elevations of Theatre Store Modular Building (drawing number 6593 P.24)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- C 3 No development other than groundworks and foundations shall take place until details of the following external materials to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Walling including all brickwork, cladding and brick detailing
- Roofing
- Windows including glazed entrance
- Doors
- Rainwater goods

The details submitted for approval shall include the name of the manufacturer, the product type, colour (using BS4800) and reference number. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 4 No work shall take on the application site (including soil stripping, preconstruction delivery of equipment or materials, the creation of site accesses) until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CMP shall include (not exclusively) the following:

- Hours of working
- Haul routes to/from the site
- Material storage locations
- Parking, turning, loading and unloading areas for all construction vehicles
- Contractor parking
- Site welfare cabin and office positions
- Measures to control the emission of dust from the site
- Wheel washing facilities, which every vehicle exiting the site must pass through before entering the public highway
- Temporary construction fencing

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CMP.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to preserve the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012). The condition is required prior to commencement to ensure that no works take place in preparing the site which would harm highway safety or neighbour amenity.

- C 5 Prior to first occupation of the extensions hereby permitted, the additional/reconfigured parking spaces shown on drawing number 6593 P.20 Revision C shall be marked out and made available for the parking of vehicles. Thereafter, those spaces shall not be used for

any purpose other than the parking of vehicles in connection with the use of the property known as Fitzwilliam Hospital in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 6 Prior to first occupation of the extensions hereby permitted, staff cycle parking for 5 bicycles which is secure and covered shall be provided in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the cycle parking shall be retained for the parking of staff cycles in connection with the site known as Fitzwilliam Hospital in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to promote more sustainable methods of travel to and from the site, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 7 Within 6 months of the completion of the development hereby permitted, a final Travel Plan based upon the principles set out within the submitted 'Workplace Travel Plan Framework' (October 2015), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the measures contained within the approved document shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable contained therein.

Reason: In order to promote more sustainable methods of travel to and from the site, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 8 In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of twelve months from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.

(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (Tree Work);

(b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority;

(c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations' before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 9 No development other than groundworks and foundations shall take place until a scheme for the soft landscaping of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the

Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include detailed planting plans, including species, numbers, size and density of planting.

The approved landscaping scheme shall be carried out within the first available planting season following first occupation of the development.

Any trees, shrubs or hedges forming part of the approved landscaping scheme that die, are removed or become diseased within five years of the implementation of the landscaping scheme shall be replaced during the next available planting season by the developers, or their successors in title with an equivalent size, number and species to those being replaced. Any replacement trees, shrubs or hedgerows dying within five years of planting shall themselves be replaced with an equivalent size, number and species.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and then enhancement of biodiversity, in accordance with policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

C10 The noise level of the plant to be incorporated into the development hereby permitted shall not exceed the following limits when measured at 1 metre from the nearest residential dwelling:

- 30dBA daytime (between 07:00 and 23:00 hours); and
- 26dBA night-time (between 23:00 and 07:00 hours).

Plant noise emissions shall be assessed in accordance with BS414:2014. Should any plant item emit noise of a tonal or irregular nature, a 5dB acoustic penalty shall be applied.

In the event of any reasonable noise complaint being received by the Local Planning Authority, the Developer or their successors in Title, shall be required to undertake a full noise assessment to demonstrate compliance with the above noise limit and submit this within 28 days of notice issued by the Local Planning Authority. Should such an assessment fail to demonstrate compliance, further mitigation measures shall be submitted alongside the noise assessment and implemented in accordance with the submitted details within 28 days of approval by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of preserving the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

Copies to Councillors: W Fitzgerald, L Ayres

This page is intentionally left blank