

Application Ref: 18/00894/FUL

Proposal: Demolition of Police Station (Sui Generis) and erection of 126 bedroomed Hotel (C1) with associated parking and circulation space

Site: Bridge Street Police Station, Bridge Street, Peterborough, PE1 1EQ

Applicant: MP MERCHANT (BS) LTD AND
PREMIER INN HOTELS LTD

Agent: Mr John Dadge
Barker Storey Matthews

Referred by: Director of Growth and Regeneration

Reason: The application is of wider public interest

Site visit: 05.06.2018

Case officer: Mrs J MacLennan

Telephone No. 01733 454438

E-Mail: janet.maclennan@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

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

Site and surroundings:

The site is approximately 0.351 ha in size and is an island site with frontage to the Rivergate Gyratory one way road system. The site is almost fully enclosed and by a boundary wall and served by a single vehicular access centrally located along the eastern frontage. Pedestrian access is gained by crossing Rivergate from the south along the riverside or from the west from Bridge Street.

The building immediately to the south on the opposite side of the road is the Old Customs House which is occupied by the Sea Scouts and is Grade II listed. To the west and north is Lower Bridge Street. The site lies within the City Centre boundary and within the Rivergate policy area. To the north-west is the city centre conservation area.

The site is vacant but was formerly occupied as a full custody police station and a motor repair workshop for police vehicles, together with associated parking. Cambridgeshire Constabulary declared the Bridge Street Police Station site surplus to requirements following the closure of the police station in 2015.

The site consists of a brick built, mainly three storey office building, on the southern portion of the site, a smaller ancillary building (previously providing office accommodation and a garage workshop for servicing police cars) on the north eastern part of the site and a car park with space to accommodate approximately 55 vehicles.

Proposal:

The application seeks approval for the demolition of the existing Police Station and the construction of a 126 bed hotel (C1) over three floors with 120 x standard bedrooms and 6 x accessible bedrooms with associated restaurant/bar/café, parking, hard and soft landscaping.

The site would be accessed via an existing vehicular access to the east of the site. 39 no. car parking spaces including 3 no. disabled parking spaces are proposed.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
P0118/76	Renewal of temporary permission for a block of three garages	Permitted	21/04/1976
P0119/76	Renewal of temporary permission for office accommodation	Permitted	07/04/1976

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.

Section 72 - General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

National Planning Policy Framework (2018)

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Decisions should ensure that development will function well and add to the overall quality of the area over the life time of the development, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout, appropriate and effective landscaping, are sympathetic to the local character and history, establish or maintain a strong sense of place, optimise the potential of the site, create places which are safe, inclusive and accessible.

Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an areas and the way it functions. Conversely where the design accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision marker as a valid reason to object to development. Local Authorities should seek to ensure that the quality of the development approved is not materially diminished between permission and completion.

Section 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Para 155. Flood Risk. Inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk. Where development is necessary in such areas the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere. Development should be subject to a sequential test and if appropriate an exceptions test.

Para 163 Flood Risk. In determining applications Local Planning Authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate applications should be supported by a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment. Development should only be allowed in areas of flooding where in lighting of the assessment (and the sequential test and exceptions test as applicable) it has been demonstrated that within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there is an overriding justification, the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient, it incorporates sustainable drainage systems unless inappropriate, any residual risk can be managed and safe access and escape routes are included as appropriate.

Section 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

New development should be appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment. In doing so they should mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life, identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and limit the impact of light pollution from artificial lighting on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.

The site should be suitable for its intended use taking account of ground conditions, land stability and pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation. After remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

Section 16 - Impact on Designated Heritage Assets

Local Planning Authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhance the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation, the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic viability and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of development great weight should be given to the assets conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Any harm to or loss of the significance of the designated heritage assets should require clear and convincing justification. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to the designated heritage assets permission should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm. Where harm is less than substantial this harm should be weighed against the public benefits including securing an optimum use of the asset.

Para 197 Impact on Non Designated Heritage Assets. The impact should be taken into account. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss of the significance of the heritage assets.

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)

CS04 - The City Centre

Promotes the enhancement of the city centre through additional comparison retail floor space especially in North Westgate, new residential development, major new cultural and leisure developments and public realm improvements, as well as protecting its historic environment.

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.

CS18 - Culture, Leisure and Tourism

Development of new cultural, leisure and tourism facilities will be encouraged particularly in the city centre

CS21 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

Development should conserve and enhance biodiversity/ geological interests unless no alternative sites are available and there are demonstrable reasons for the development.

CS22 - Flood Risk

Development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will only be permitted if specific criteria are met. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate.

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.

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 City Centre DPD (2014)**PCC05 - Rivergate Policy Area**

Mixed-use development incorporating approximately 100 dwellings will be supported provided that it assists the delivery of improved foot/cycle connections and conserves the listed buildings in the area.

PCC11 - Transport

Within the area of the City Centre Plan, all development which has transport implications will be expected to make a contribution to the delivery of the City Centre Transport Vision.

The provision of additional car parking spaces will be resisted within the City Core Policy Area.

Elsewhere in the City Centre new residential development within classes C3 and C4 will be expected to make provision for car parking in accordance with Policy PP13 of the Planning Policies DPD. There will be no minimum requirement for car parking spaces in association with any other type of development. Additional spaces will only be allowed if the development has provided a fully justification.

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (now at examination stage)

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 Proposed Submission version of the Local Plan took place in January and February 2018. The Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State on 26 March 2018 and is now at examination stage.

Paragraph 216 of the National Planning states that decision makers may give weight to relevant policies in an emerging plan according to:-

- the stage of the Plan (the more advanced the plan, the more weight which can be given)
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the policies
- the degree of consistency between emerging policies and the framework.

The policies can be used alongside adopted policies in the decision making process, especially where the plan contains new policies. The amount of weight to be given to the emerging plan policies is a matter for the decision maker. At this final stage the weight to be given to the emerging plan is more substantial than at the earlier stages although the 'starting point' for decision making remains the adopted Local Plan.

LP06 - The City Centre - Overarching Strategy

Promotes the enhancement of the city centre. Major new retail, culture and leisure developments will be encouraged. It is promoted as a location for new residential development and as a location for employment development including mixed use. Improvements to the public realm will be promoted and the historic environment protected.

LP13 - Transport

LP13a) New development should ensure that appropriate provision is made for the transport needs that it will create including reducing the need to travel by car, prioritisation of bus use, improved walking and cycling routes and facilities.

LP13b) The Transport Implications of Development- Permission will only be granted where appropriate provision has been made for safe access for all user groups and subject to appropriate mitigation.

LP13c) Parking Standards- permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

LP13d) City Centre- All proposal must demonstrate that careful consideration has been given to prioritising pedestrian access, to improving access for those with mobility issues, to encouraging cyclists and to reducing the need for vehicles to access the area.

LP16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

Development proposals would contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness of the area. They should make effective and efficient use of land and buildings, be durable and flexible, use appropriate high quality materials, maximise pedestrian permeability and legibility, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, and be accessible to all.

LP17 - Amenity Provision

LP17a) Part A Amenity of Existing Occupiers- 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.

LP17b) Part B Amenity of Future Occupiers- Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

LP19 - The Historic Environment

Development should protect, conserve and enhance where appropriate the local character and distinctiveness of the area particularly in areas of high heritage value.

Unless it is explicitly demonstrated that a proposal meets the tests of the NPPF permission will only be granted for development affecting a designated heritage asset where the impact would not lead to substantial loss or harm. Where a proposal would result in less than substantial harm this harm will be weighed against the public benefit.

Proposals which fail to preserve or enhance the setting of a designated heritage asset will not be supported.

LP28 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

Part 1: Designated Site

International Sites- The highest level of protection will be afforded to these sites. Proposals which would have an adverse impact on the integrity of such areas and which cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where there are no suitable alternatives, overriding public interest and subject to appropriate compensation.

National Sites- Proposals within or outside a SSSI likely to have an adverse effect will not normally be permitted unless the benefits outweigh the adverse impacts.

Local Sites- Development likely to have an adverse effect will only be permitted where the need and benefits outweigh the loss.

Habitats and Species of Principal Importance- Development proposals will be considered in the context of the duty to promote and protect species and habitats. Development which would have an adverse impact will only be permitted where the need and benefit clearly outweigh the impact. Appropriate mitigation or compensation will be required.

Part 2: Habitats and Geodiversity in Development

All proposals should conserve and enhance avoiding a negative impact on biodiversity and geodiversity.

Part 3: Mitigation of Potential Adverse Impacts of Development

Development should avoid adverse impact as the first principle. Where such impacts are unavoidable they must be adequately and appropriately mitigated. Compensation will be required as a last resort.

LP32 - Flood and Water Management

Proposals should adopt a sequential approach to flood risk management in line with the NPPF and council's Flood and Water Management SPD.. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate. Development proposals should also protect the water environment.

LP48 - Rivergate Policy Area

The principle of a retail-led, mixed use development incorporating approximately 60 dwellings will be supported provided that it assists the delivery of improved pedestrian and cycle connections, makes provision for active uses through the day and evening and conserves the listed buildings in the area. Development adjacent to the River Nene should take opportunities to improve the river and/ or its banks. Any proposals for comprehensive development of this area must be supported by a master plan or development brief.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Conservation Officer – No objection. With the site being currently vacant, the site is becoming increasingly deteriorated in appearance and a feeling of 'deadness' that is associated with such inactivity. The vacant site currently has a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of this very busy and prominent arterial route into the City Centre. It is also seen in conjunction with a Grade II* Customs House, adjacent and within the setting of the Grade I Peterborough Cathedral, especially in longer views crossing the bridge from the south bank.

Previous pre-application proposals have been discussed at length with Historic England, in terms of impacts on the aforementioned heritage assets. A 2005 pre-application enquiry was subject to broad height parameters considered by the previous Conservation Officer and Historic England. The general view was that development should be limited in height to 2-3 storey.

I agree with the comments of the Civic Society that there is an opportunity to re-design the gyratory to better effect in terms of highways. However, disruption and cost have likely put any ambition to do this entirely out of reach. As such my comments relate to the current site boundary, highway in its existing position and the application as submitted. I would support any proposal to re-design the road network to better effect.

The proposal has been subject to a number of recent design reviews, prior to submission. The quality of the proposal has been improved significantly from its first iteration, but still remains somewhat hindered by the regimented window layout, which is dictated by the rigid internal floor layout of absolutely identical rooms throughout the building. The fact that the entrance is not on the corner and does not extend beyond the ground floor is also a negative in the design, however, as previously mentioned, such requests do not meet the future occupiers needs and therefore has been submitted as it currently stands. They have however made attempts to make improvements throughout the process.

The proposal has come in at the maximum height permissible, of three storey with a flat roof, which is also supported by Historic England, in relation to impact on views of the Cathedral when travelling over Town Bridge. Historic England has commented on the proposal and is generally supportive. This is largely due to the fact that their scale, massing and road fronting advice has been followed from a 2015 pre-app.

It is positive that the corner elevations facing both Lower Bridge Street and Town Bridge have been addressed with improved corner treatment that adds interest to the streetscene and adds to what would otherwise be a rather boxy building with a flat roof.

However, I am still concerned by the lack of any proper frontage, especially on the corner facing towards the bridge. The use of brick detailing to treat what is essentially a blank first and second floor still has the impression of the internal arrangement dictating the exterior detailing. This corner should be visually strong and the main entrance, but remains wanting.

The North West elevation will not be particularly prominent from Bridge Street and will only be seen at an oblique angle. Main views of this elevation will be gained from the gyratory. Whilst I agree with the Civic Society's comments of it being monolithic, it will remain a lesser seen elevation in both longer and shorter views.

Although proposed to be constructed in buff brick, the colour palette picks up on the stone colours of the Cathedral and the Old Customs House. Due to the prominence of the site, a full scheme of materials should be submitted, as the plans currently do not provide sufficient detail on this.

Revised comments following amendments

Having viewed the latest 3D drawings, I am content that significant improvements have been made throughout the pre-app and application process. The design of the new construction is in many ways being led by strict internal room configurations of the type of hotel it will accommodate. Whilst not likely to win any design awards, it is in a position design and material quality to be on balance acceptable within its surroundings and a substantial improvement upon what exists on site.

The red brick perimeter wall, will sit comfortably with the proposed new materials for the building. The suggestion by the agent of brick tinting could be a solution, however, it is important to note that the process has varying degrees of visual success depending upon the skill of the person applying the tint. Would be ideal to secure by condition a sample in order to ensure a good match.

In relation to the materials and details of the building, we have seen various 3D images and examples from other buildings, but materials and finer details of the brickwork etc secured by condition, would be necessary to ensure a good finish.

From a heritage consideration the proposed works can be supported.

PCC Peterborough Highways Services – No objection. The traffic surveys were undertaken during the (ongoing) construction of the new access to the station car park. The traffic management for this scheme extends to the Rivergate/Bishops Road junction. This means that the surveys are likely to show less traffic on Bridge Street, Rivergate and Bishops Road.

The crossing from the site to the central island on the 'signalised' Rivergate crossing is actually an uncontrolled crossing.

The proposed vehicle trip generation for this site is lower than expected. There is a proposed site in the City Centre in a far more sustainable location (i.e. close to the bus and rail station) that predicted higher vehicle trip rates.

It is agreed that the traffic generation from this site will not have a significant impact on the network even taking the above into consideration. The only concern would be the cumulative impact of lack of the controlled crossing facility to the site, the increase in traffic movements the road which pedestrians will be required to cross and also the rise in pedestrians accessing the site.

I don't think we can signalise the crossing now because the number of lanes on Rivergate was reduced from 3 to 2 as part of the highway scheme last year. This means that if signals were incorporated on the lane closest to the police station then queues would form back around towards Bishop's Road which is clearly undesirable.

The LHA is comfortable with the levels of intended use given the nature of the development. CMP will be important so as to limit the activity on the adjacent highway network during peak periods.

PCC Pollution Team - The proposal is affected by high levels of noise from road traffic. Considerable attention via glazing and walls/roof will be necessary in order to achieve suitable noise levels within bedrooms. Recommends that noise mitigation measures contained within the noise report are conditioned.

Where sound insulation requirements precluded opening windows for rapid ventilation and cooling, as in this situation, mechanical ventilation systems will need to be installed. Acoustic trickle ventilators will not provide adequate ventilation for these purposes. The details should be secured by condition.

The nearest residential properties are 27m from the facade of the proposed development, and the plant room situated approximately 64m from the residential properties. As noted in the noise report additional mitigation/attenuation will be necessary. These details should be secured by condition.

There is the potential for odour from the kitchen associated with the development to cause problems for nearby residents. Suitable mitigation will therefore be required.

The development is near to a modelled exceedance in air quality standards. Should the use change to residential or the development include staff living in, consideration of air quality standards and modelling would be necessary.

Archaeological Officer – No objection. The proposed development site is located within the historic core of the city, immediately to the south of the scheduled Cathedral Precincts and to the north of the equally scheduled Customs House.

Cartographic evidence shows that the subject site was already developed by the end of the 19th century. However, investigations along Bridge Street have revealed complex sequences of development from the medieval period. In particular, work carried out on the side of Bridge Street opposite the Police Station unearthed a line of upright oak timbers set along the edge of river and into a palaeochannel infilling that contained 13th century artefacts, west of the present Town Bridge. The timbers may have formed a structure to protect the bridgehead from the effects of tidal scouring or alternatively they could have formed a section of wharf. The occurrence of in-filled river channel material to their rear indicates a degree of land reclamation and perhaps channel straightening in the medieval period.

It is possible that foundations of former structures, evidence for hythe and loading sites may survive at deeper depths within the proposed development site. Pockets of undisturbed ground may contain well-preserved remains surviving at shallower depths.

Notwithstanding the presence of two scheduled monuments in close proximity, the proposed development should have minimal impact on the setting.

On the basis of the available evidence, it is recommended archaeological monitoring of demolition work, followed by an assessment of the ground conditions, in order to inform an investigation strategy. An evaluation by trial trenching of selected areas is the preferred option, if feasible.

Lead Local Drainage Authority – No objection. The FRA and Drainage Strategy reduces the existing discharge to the greenfield rate which is good to see, tie that with the permeable paving and the drainage for this site is acceptable to us. Further details should be secured by condition and agreed prior to commencement.

PCC Wildlife Officer – No objection. Given their design and age, the buildings proposed for demolition are unlikely to support protected species, including bats, and note the applicant states that a visual survey of the buildings has been carried out by an ecologist with no evidence of bats found. There are opportunities for biodiversity gain and I would recommend the following measures to enhance the development for biodiversity: Incorporation of bird nesting and/ or bat roosting features within the site; use of bio-diverse green roofs on the sections of flat roof which would complement the proposed PV panels.

Peterborough Cycling Forum - Welcomes the proposal to install covered Sheffield cycle stands close to an entrance to the hotel. This follows best practice; the provision is secure and covered and the location is convenient and benefits from a high level of surveillance.

In the case of an hotel, Peterborough City Council (PCC) parking standards require 1 stand per 4 staff plus 1 stand per 10 bedrooms. It is noted that Premier Inn operates bike friendly hotels and allows bicycles to be kept in rooms if required. This is highly commended, although there is no guarantee this policy will not change in future, either under existing or different ownership. It is also noted the Travel Plan Coordinator will monitor the facility and 'if it regularly reaches capacity additional provision will be sought' (Travel Plan, 9.2.5). This should be firmed up by condition. Subject to the condition and in view of the policy to permit guests to store cycles in their room, the Cycle Forum is happy to accept this shortfall in cycle parking.

Welcomes the provision of related infrastructure including showers and changing facilities for staff, basic cycle maintenance equipment, and promotion of 'Ride 2 Work'.

The site is located on an 'island' surrounded by a high volume of traffic on the multiple lane Rivergate gyratory. Motor vehicle access is directly from the gyratory but this is not a safe or convenient access route for cyclists who, to enter the site, would have to turn right across two lanes of traffic. The only safe access route for cyclists is to arrive with pedestrians at the front of the hotel, via two crossings. Unless all cyclists, (staff and guests), are to be routed through the front door and reception area, a route must be provided around the outside of the building in order to access the cycle parking and rear entrance of the hotel.

Environment Agency – No objections. The previous use as police station and car maintenance workshop presents a risk of contamination that could be mobilised during construction to pollute controlled waters. Controlled waters are sensitive in this location because the proposed development site is located upon Secondary aquifer A over a Principal Aquifer and the River Nene lies within 50 m of the site. The Planning Statement submitted in support of this planning application provides us with confidence that it will be possible to suitably manage the risk posed to controlled waters by this development. Further detailed information will however be required before built development is undertaken. Request conditions regarding contamination and foul drainage.

Natural England - Consultation Service – No objections. Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected sites or landscapes. The proposed development will not have likely significant effects on the Nene Washes Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar and will not damage or destroy the interest features for the SSSI – Nene Washes.

Historic England - No objections. The height, massing and design of the replacement hotel would not adversely affect the setting of either of the heritage assets and that the materials would not jar when viewed against these historic buildings. The proposal meets the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework with respect to the historic environment and there are no objections on heritage grounds.

Anglian Water – No objection. There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Peterborough (Flag Fen) Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows. The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows.

The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option. Building Regulations (part H) on Drainage and Waste Disposal for England includes a surface water drainage hierarchy, with infiltration on site as the preferred disposal option, followed by discharge to watercourse and then connection to a sewer.

The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is unacceptable. No evidence has been provided to show that the surface water hierarchy has been followed as stipulated in Building Regulations Part H. This encompasses the trial pit logs from the infiltration tests and the investigations in to discharging to a watercourse. If these methods are deemed to be unfeasible for the site, we require confirmation of the intended manhole connection point and discharge rate proposed before a connection to the public surface water sewer is permitted. We would therefore recommend that the applicant needs to consult with Anglian Water and the Environment Agency.

The planning application includes employment/commercial use. To discharge trade effluent from trade premises to a public sewer vested in Anglian Water requires our consent. It is an offence under section 118 of the Water Industry Act 1991 to discharge trade effluent to sewer without consent. Anglian Water would ask that the following text be included within your Notice should permission be granted.

Peterborough Civic Society – Objects. Firstly, a great opportunity to improve traffic, pedestrian movement and the setting of the historic Old Custom House has been missed. The Rivergate gyratory road layout was devised when the bus station was relocated to Queensgate in the 1980's and when the lower part of Bridge Street was pedestrianised. The police station, which was then fairly modern and fully functioning, stood in the way of a logical realignment of the road as it emerged from Town Bridge, hence the splitting of the road into two one-way carriageways. Now that the police station is to be demolished it should be possible to safeguard land for a realignment of Rivergate when finance is available. The benefits of doing so are numerous. For one it would make crossing of Bridge Street for pedestrians much easier to the police station site and the Embankment. Vehicular traffic would be less delayed. The setting of the Customs House would be enhanced with a wide traffic free area between it and the proposed building. The hotel could utilise part of this area as an outdoor extension to its lobby/restaurant and bar facilities, an increasingly popular feature especially valuable where a building has a south facing aspect. The closure to vehicles of part of Rivergate would provide a development site to the east of the police station site which could be used to finance the road realignment.

The potential of this idea deserves to be fully explored. It would require some major redesign of the proposals currently under consideration but may not require any reduction in the floorspace to be accommodated on the slightly reduced site area. All that is required at this stage is to set the hotel building a few metres inboard of the Rivergate kerb line on the Bridge Street side. The sketch plan attached shows how this would affect the proposals.

The second area of concern is on architectural design. Although the architects have recognised the importance of protecting views of the Cathedral and have kept the roof –line of the hotel at the same level as the existing building the architectural quality is below what we would expect to see at this gateway to the city centre. The two main elevations to Rivergate manage to look uninteresting and busy at the same time. The long low shape of the two wings is punctuated by windows at regular intervals on each of the three floors with an offset in the first floor range which gives an unsettling jerkiness to the facade.

The elevation to the north-west is monolithic, more suited to a landscaped parkland setting rather than an urban centre. It would jar, visually, with the west side of Bridge Street which is highly articulated, comprising a great variety of building types and frontages. The south elevation is of smaller scale but includes five brickwork panels which give the unfortunate impression of openings which have been bricked up. The view from the east is of an open car park. The break in the screen wall for the access is too wide, failing to channel the view sufficiently. A good case is made in the Design & Access statement for the recessed corner feature as a focal point at this important arrival point. The recessed corner treatment is essentially a weak visual device which the designers have sought to address by using elaborate brickwork detailing and a diagonal canopy at roof level. Unfortunately the impact has been further weakened in locating the entrance to the hotel some distance to the north due to the need to provide a ramped footpath down to the foyer level, which is about three steps lower than the ground level. A dog-leg ramp could be used to bring the entrance

doors back to the focal point. Setting the building back from the road by about 3 -5 metres at the corner would make this possible.

The necessity to keep the profile of the hotel relatively low and level suggests that a strong horizontal emphasis could be used to give a distinct character to the structure. The shape of the site also hints that a curved plan form would reflect that shape, again making for a distinctive building.

Materials and detailing should be restrained and simple, letting basic form create the desired 'sense of place'. The line drawing sketch attached illustrates this treatment.

The Peterborough Civic Society would like to see these comments addressed and in the absence of amendments or convincing explanations must object to the granting of permission for the submitted scheme.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 52

Total number of responses: 3

Total number of objections: 3

Total number in support: 0

One letter of objection has been received raising the following issues:

- the pollution that will be caused by the demolition of an already standing building and noise!
- the reconstruction of a large Hotel which might cut the light that streams into my Flat most days!
- the development will cause a lot of traffic problems during the building of the Hotel
- we have an opportunity to improve the road layout here and also enhance the area for pedestrians in light of the development work at Fletton Quays. The proposed plan would not enable this and seems a waste and the easy option.
- I fully support the suggestions by the Peterborough Civic Society to the current planning submission to realign and rejoin the northbound and southbound carriageways of Rivergate to remove the current highways dominance in this area, particularly in such close proximity to Old Custom House, a Grade 2 listed building.
Not only would the newly created pedestrian area between the new hotel (which I do not object to at all) and the Old Custom House have the advantage of having a quieter, riverside facing side of the hotel for guests, it would also have a much improved journey to Fletton Quays for visitors walking from the train station as well as away supporters on their way to the Football ground.
I hope the Council's planning committee are able to ensure these amendments are proposed to the developer and can be incorporated into the eventual scheme

5 Assessment of the planning issues

a) Background

The proposed works have been the subject of pre-application discussion with Planning Officers, the Principal Conservation Officer and Historic England. There have been a number of iterations to the design of the building.

b) The Principle of Development

Policy context

The site lies to the south of the city centre and is located within the 'Rivergate Policy Area' as defined under policy CC5 of the adopted Peterborough City Centre Plan DPD. This area provides an important link from the city centre core to the river Nene. The vision for the area is primarily to create a more prominent retail location that is better integrated with the City Core. This part of the city has undergone significant improvements to the public realm of lower Bridge Street. Active frontages

along this route are encouraged throughout the day and evening. Policy CC5 supports the principle of retail led, mixed-use development and envisages residential development. The policy also recognises the importance of new development must conserves the listed buildings located in the area. Policy CC5 also states that for comprehensive development of the Rivergate area, proposals must be supported with a Development Brief, Masterplan or SPD.

In addition, Policy CS18 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy recognises the importance of creating a thriving city centre with the provision of cultural and leisure facilities. The city experiences high numbers of visitors each year and the policy supports, amongst other things, the provision of more conference and catering facilities and venues, high quality hotels and accommodation.

It is considered that the proposal would regenerate this important gateway site and provide a positive contribution to this part of the city centre and would complement the offer of services and facilities for the city and would accord with policies CC5 of the Adopted Peterborough City Centre Plan and policy CS18 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy.

Objections have been made by the Peterborough Civic Society who consider that the proposal would be a missed opportunity to improve traffic, pedestrian movement and the setting of the historic Old Custom House. The Civic Society state that *'the Rivergate gyratory road layout was devised when the bus station was relocated to Queensgate in the 1980's and when the lower part of Bridge Street was pedestrianised. The police station, which was then fairly modern and fully functioning, stood in the way of a logical realignment of the road as it emerged from Town Bridge, hence the splitting of the road into two one-way carriageways. Now that the police station is to be demolished it should be possible to safeguard land for a realignment of Rivergate when finance is available.'*

The Civic Society argues that there would be benefits in doing so, *'For one it would make crossing of Bridge Street for pedestrians much easier to the police station site and the Embankment. Vehicular traffic would be less delayed. The setting of the Customs House would be enhanced with a wide traffic free area between it and the proposed building. The hotel could utilise part of this area as an outdoor extension to its lobby/restaurant and bar facilities, an increasingly popular feature especially valuable where a building has a south facing aspect. The closure to vehicles of part of Rivergate would provide a development site to the east of the police station site which could be used to finance the road realignment.'* The Civic Society has provided a sketch plan of how the area could be designed.

It is accepted that the a comprehensive development of the whole area would be the preferred approach however, the comprehensive redevelopment of the area would involve land outside the applicant's control and as stated above this site has become available for development and therefore the proposal is considered on its merits. It would be unreasonable to refuse the application on the basis that it is not part of a wider comprehensive development and policy CC5 does not require this.

c) Impact on Heritage Assets

Policy Context

The site is located in view of the Cathedral and the Old Customs House which is a Grade II listed building and therefore the proposal has the potential to harm the setting of these buildings. The City Centre Conservation Area is located to the north west of the site.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2018) outlines government policy, including its policy in respect of the conservation of the historic environment. Paragraph 8 advises that development should sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets and great weight is given to conserving designated heritage assets. Section 16 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' sets out high level policies concerning heritage and sustainable development. The approach set out in paragraphs 184-188 are of particular relevance.

The site is located within the setting of the City Centre Conservation Area, close to listed and locally listed buildings and development will impact on the setting of a number of important heritage assets. Section 72 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 places a duty on the LPA to pay 'special regard' to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the special character or appearance of conservation areas. The policies in the NPPF seek positive improvement in conservation areas.

Development of the site has the potential to impact on the wider setting of nearby listed buildings. The Local Planning Authority has a duty under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Section 66(1) when considering whether to grant permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting to have a special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their special features and their setting, with the latter often an essential ingredient of its character.

Considerable weight and importance should be given to the avoidance of harm to conservation areas and the significance of a listed building and its setting. The presumption against the avoidance of harm is a statutory one, and can only be outweighed if there are material considerations strong enough to do so.

The Peterborough Local Plan provides the framework of local planning policies with which to make planning decisions. These policies are in conformity with the NPPF.

In accordance with policy PP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD a heritage statement supports the application.

Whilst the existing building is of no architectural merit it does not compete with these important historic assets and sits lower than the Old Customs House building. The applicant was advised during pre-application discussions that the building should be no higher than the neighbouring Old Customs House building.

The height of the new building would align with the Old Customs House. The extent of built form on the southern element of the site has also been reduced, compared to the existing built-form, shortening the length of building directly opposite the Old Customs House.

Corner position

At the south west corner, the junction of the southern and western elements of the building creates a reveal in the elevations and a canopy is proposed over this area. This corner position is an important aspect as it appears as the arrival to the site. Several proposals for the treatment of the upper floor facades to the reveals have been proposed, including a patterned brick detail, however it was felt that the elevation was still lacking. The applicant was advised to give this element further consideration and suggested some form of window detail would improve this elevation. Windows have now been added to the upper floor reveals with patterned cladding which adds interest and relief to these elevations. It is proposed that the overhung canopy would create changes in light and shade during the daytime and at night through a carefully designed lighting scheme; the details of lighting would be secured by condition.

The Civic Society has objected to the design and architectural quality of the building given the gateway location stating *'the two main elevations to Rivergate manage to look uninteresting and busy at the same time; the long low shape of the two wings is punctuated by windows at regular intervals on each of the three floors with an offset in the first floor range which gives an unsettling jerkiness to the façade; the elevation to the north-west is monolithic and would jar, visually, with the west side of Bridge Street which is highly articulated, comprising a great variety of building types and frontages. The south elevation is of smaller scale but includes five brickwork panels which give the unfortunate impression of openings which have been bricked-up. The view from the east is of an open car park. The break in the screen wall for the access is too wide, failing to channel the view sufficiently.'*

It is the Conservation Officer's view that the North West elevation will not be particularly prominent from Bridge Street and will only be seen at an oblique angle. Main views of this elevation will be gained from the gyratory. Whilst the Officer agrees with the Civic Society's comments of it being monolithic, it will remain a lesser seen elevation in both longer and shorter views.

The Conservation Officer considers that the quality of the proposal has been improved significantly from its first iteration. The Officer acknowledges that the design is still somewhat hindered by the regimented window layout, which is dictated by the rigid internal floor layout requirement of the hotel occupier. The fact that the entrance is not on the corner and does not extend beyond the ground floor is also a negative in the design, however, such requests do not meet the future occupier's needs. However, it is positive that the corner elevations facing both Lower Bridge Street and Town Bridge have been addressed with improved corner treatment that adds interest to the streetscene.

It is considered that the combination of windows, materials and the canopy creates more interest to this prominent corner space providing a visual appeal and a sense of arrival to what would have been a very bland unwelcoming space.

The proposal has come in at the maximum height permissible, of three storey with a flat roof, which is also supported by Historic England, in relation to impact on views of the Cathedral when travelling over Town Bridge. Historic England has commented on the proposal and is generally supportive. This is largely due to the fact that their scale, massing and road fronting advice has been followed from a 2015 pre-app.

Entrance

The entrance to the building would be within the west elevation approximately 10m to the north of the pedestrian crossing and not on the corner where the access to the police station is currently located.. Due to the height restriction set by the Old Custom House, the proposed ground floor level of the Hotel has been set lower than external ground level. It is stated that there wasn't the space for ramps and landings to accommodate the level change, therefore there would be a gradient of 1:21 from the pedestrian crossing down to the front of the building which has determined the location of the entrance.

The applicant states that due to the operational and functional needs of the future occupier, the reception has to be located between the restaurant / back of house areas and the bedrooms therefore the reception and entrance would be situated central to the building which works well with the distance required for the change in level to the proposed ground floor.

It is acknowledged that an internal layout with the entrance on the corner with a first floor restaurant/bar would have added interest and activity to this element of the building however as stated above this would not meet with the occupier's requirements.

The Civic Society considers the impact has been further weakened in locating the entrance to the hotel some distance to the north and suggests a dog-leg ramp could be used to bring the entrance doors back to the focal point. Setting the building back from the road by about 3 -5 metres at the corner would make this possible.

Other Design Matters

The Civic Society also suggests that *'the shape of the site also hints that a curved plan form would reflect that shape, again making for a distinctive building. Materials and detailing should be restrained and simple, letting basic form create the desired 'sense of place'.*

As stated above, the scheme has been the subject of a pre-application enquiry and a number of design proposals have been considered. Further revisions have been made since the formal application was submitted including the addition of upper floor windows and the addition of detailing within the corner reveal.

It is important that the perimeter wall, which is to be retained for the most part, sits comfortably with the proposed new materials for the building. The applicant has suggested brick tinting could be a solution. These details would be secured by condition. A plan has also been submitted reducing the length of wall around the hotel entrance to expose this elevation and additional landscaping is proposed.

In relation to the materials and details of the building, the applicant has provided a number of 3D images and examples from other buildings, but materials and finer details of the brickwork etc would also be secured by condition to ensure a good quality finish.

Conclusion

The Conservation Officer considers that significant improvements have been made throughout the pre-app and application process. The design of the new construction is in many ways being led by the internal room configurations of the type of hotel it will accommodate. The changes in levels needs to accommodate a 3 storey building as well as the access point and the size and shape of the site. It is considered that the design and material quality is on balance acceptable within its surroundings and a substantial improvement upon what exists on site. From a heritage consideration the proposed works are supported.

The proposal will bring economic benefits to the city through the provision of hotel accommodation which will support the local economy and the city centre leisure offer.

The existing building does not contribute significantly positively to the setting of the Old Customs House or the Cathedral or the Conservation area and the proposed building would represent a significant improvement. The proposal would represent an improvement to the existing setting and would not harm the significance of the two heritage assets.

It is considered that the work will preserve the character and appearance of the City Centre Conservation Area and positively contribute to the setting of the Cathedral and Old Customs House in accordance with Section 72(1), of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) and is in accordance with policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), and policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (Heritage considerations).

d) Design and Visual Amenity

Layout

The layout of the building on the southern and western boundaries and the retained boundary wall would respect the existing built form and sense of enclosure and would screen the parking area to the rear of the site. Although the entrance would be further along the western boundary access to the site from the pedestrian crossing would be convenient.

Scale

The applicant was advised that the new building would be no higher than the ridge of the Old Customs House when viewed from the southern approach to the city centre over town bridge. The development proposed achieves three storeys without breaching the Old Customs House roofline utilising the lower level within the site set by the existing semi basement level. The scale of the development is considered to be acceptable and would respect the surrounding built form.

Appearance

Whilst the existing building is not considered to be of any architectural merit it is not harmful to the surrounding heritage assets, notably the Cathedral and the Old Customs House. The proposed brickwork would be a buff colour with matching mortar. The elevations would also include feature brickwork panels to add interest to the elevations as well as visual relief.

It is accepted that given the proposed use of the building the elevations are somewhat repetitive however, an attempt has been made to add interests to the elevations by way of offsetting the windows on the upper floors and the addition of detailing.

The layout, scale and appearance of the proposed development is considered to be acceptable and would not detract from the surrounding character of the site. Hence the proposal accords with policies PP2 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

e) Highway Implications

A Transport Assessment has been submitted in support of the application. The purpose of the Assessment is to assess the suitability of the site for the proposed development in transport terms and considers the location of the site the access and the level of traffic that might be generated by the proposed use.

The Assessment concludes that there would be a slightly higher increase in traffic movements in the AM during peak times with lesser impact during the PM peak times as traffic movements are more likely to be distributed throughout the afternoon and evening periods.

The Local Highways Authority has assessed the information and advises that the travel surveys were undertaken during the (ongoing) construction of the new access to the station car park. The traffic management for this scheme extends to the Rivergate/Bishops Road junction. Therefore the surveys are likely to show less traffic on Bridge Street, Rivergate and Bishops Road than would normally be the case.

The proposed vehicle trip generation for this site is lower than expected. There is a proposed site in the City Centre in a far more sustainable location (i.e. close to the bus and rail station) that predicted higher vehicle trip rates.

However the LHA agree that the traffic generation from this site will not have a significant impact on the network even taking the above into consideration.

The LHA raised the issue of the increase in traffic movements and the increase in pedestrians accessing the site from the crossing which is not signalised. The crossing from the site to the central island on the 'signalised' Rivergate crossing is actually an uncontrolled crossing.

The number of lanes on Rivergate was reduced from 3 to 2 as part of the highway scheme last year. To signalise the crossing now would result in queuing of traffic towards Bishop's Road which would be undesirable. The Local Highways Authority is comfortable with the levels of intended use given the nature of the development.

Access

Access to the site would be via an existing access to the east of the site. This access forms a junction onto the A15 Rivergate gyratory which incorporates two lanes running southbound past the site access. All vehicles must therefore enter the site from the north and exit to the south. The access would be slightly widened to accommodate the passage of larger vehicles into and out of the site. A tracking plan supports the application and demonstrates that a large articulated vehicle can enter the site, manoeuvre and leave in forward gear.

Parking

In accordance with the parking standards under policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD for a 126 bed hotel one parking space per bedroom is required plus one space per 10m² of dining area, if this area is open to the public. The total number of car parking spaces required for the proposed hotel is 149 spaces. These are maximum parking standards.

The proposed hotel will have its own on site car park with 39 parking spaces of which 3 spaces will be allocated as disabled spaces. It is accepted that the provision is lower than the recommended standard however, in this case the site is conveniently located for the city centre and is an accessible location for non-car modes of travel.

The application is supported with a Travel Plan which includes measures to encourage hotel employees and guests to consider non-car travel to access the site. It is advised that hotel employees would not be permitted to park on-site.

In addition, it is accepted that the majority of Premier Inn bookings are made online, the booking page for the proposed hotel would be set up to inform guests that limited parking is provided on-site which is available on a first come, first served basis. The hotel information page would also highlight the nearest public transport facilities e.g. Peterborough Rail Station and identify the nearest Public Car Parks for those guests who choose to travel by car.

On balance, given the site's location and its accessibility to the railway/bus station and nearby public car parks it is considered that the provision of car parking would be sufficient to serve the site and therefore the proposal would accord with policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (submission version).

Cycle Parking

The cycle parking standards require one stand per four staff plus one stand per 10 bedrooms, 4 no. parking stands are to be provided. It is expected that the cycle parking would be used primarily by staff and these will need to be covered. The details would be secured by condition.

It is accepted that it is unlikely that most of the guests would arrive at the site by cycle and in any event, it is advised that Premier Inn operates a policy whereby guests can take their cycle to the room. Therefore the shortfall in cycle parking is accepted.

The cycle stands are to be located to the rear of the site adjacent to the rear entrance. This is considered to be the correct location however there is no cycle access path at the rear. This issue has been raised by the Cycle Forum who have suggested the provision of a cycle path at the side of the building. The applicant confirmed that a path could be provided however, this would be on highway verge. The LHA has confirmed that this land should not be used as a footway or any other conduit for accessing the hotel car park due to the fact that it would negatively impact on highway safety by encouraging pedestrian access to a section of Rivergate on which there is no safe crossing point.

This was raised with the applicant and it has been confirmed that cyclists arriving at the front of the site would be able to wheel their cycle through the reception to the rear of the building to access the cycle parking. This is acceptable.

In addition, it is stated in the Travel Plan that should the level of cycle parking prove to be inadequate, further cycle parking would be provided. These details could be secured by condition.

It is considered that adequate provision would be available for cycle parking and the proposal therefore accords with policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Given the city centre location and the accessibility to alternative means of transport and the proximity of the site to a number of public car parks it is not considered that the proposal would result in an adverse impact on the highway network. Hence the proposal accords with policies PP12 and PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

f) Amenity

The site is located on an island site surrounded by a busy highway network. As advised within the

accompanying noise assessment the background noise levels in the vicinity of the site are high. The Noise Pollution Officer has advised that considerable attention to glazing and walls/roof will be necessary in order to achieve suitable noise levels within bedrooms. It is recommended that the noise mitigation measures contained within the noise report are secured by condition.

Where sound insulation requirements preclude opening windows for rapid ventilation and cooling, as in this situation, mechanical ventilation systems will need to be installed. Acoustic trickle ventilators will not provide adequate ventilation for these purposes. These details would also be secured by condition.

The nearest residential properties are 27m from the facade of the proposed development, and the plant room situated approximately 64m from the residential properties. As noted in the noise report additional mitigation/attenuation will be necessary. These details should be secured by condition.

There is the potential for odour from the kitchen associated with the development to cause problems for nearby residents. Suitable mitigation will therefore be required.

The development is near to a modelled exceedance in air quality standards. Should the use change to residential or the development include staff living in consideration of air quality standards and modelling would be necessary but any change of use currently needs planning permission.

There is a residential development to the west of the site – Rivergate Flats, however given the characteristics of the site at the edge of the city centre it is not considered that the hotel use would unduly impact upon the amenity of these nearby residential occupants from a noise and disturbance point of view.

One letter of objection from an occupier of the Rivergate flats has been received raising concerns about the pollution and noise that would be caused through the demolition of the building. It is accepted that there would be some disruption during the demolition and construction period however, this would be for a limited period and construction hours would be controlled under a Construction Management Plan.

In addition the objector states that the position of the building would impact on levels of light afforded by the occupier. However, whilst the building would be higher than the existing building given that there is a separation distance of some 27m between the site and the Rivergate flats it is not considered that the proposal would impact significantly on levels of light/overshadowing.

The proposal would not unduly impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers and hence the proposal accords with policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

g) Ecology

There is no habitat on the site. The site is entirely hard surfaced save for the maintained verge on the outside of the perimeter wall forming part of the adopted highway. A biodiversity checklist is provided with this application and a visual examination for opportunities for bat roosts has been undertaken by an ecologist. The inspection concluded that there is no evidence of bat roosts and given that the existing building has been well maintained and is flat roofed it is unlikely that any are present. The Wildlife Officer accepts this assessment.

The Wildlife Officer has requested enhancement to the biodiversity of the site through the provision of bird boxes and the incorporation of green roof space to the flat roof elements of the scheme. It is accepted that there is the opportunity for biodiversity enhancements and the details of bird boxes would be secured by condition, however given the sensitivity of the site it is not considered appropriate to insist on a green roof in this instance. The proposal would therefore comply with policy PP16 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

h) Landscaping and Open Space/Amenity Space

There is currently no landscaping within the site and there is limited space within the site for landscaping. Through pre-application discussions Officers confirmed that a rooftop garden would not be appropriate in this instance as it would interrupt the Cathedral views and lead to an “active” roof scape with associated paraphernalia. The details of surfacing materials and soft landscaping would be secured by condition.

i) Flood Risk and Drainage

A site-specific FRA and drainage strategy accompanies this application. The site is located within Flood Zone 1 on the Environment Agency (EA) Flood map. Flood Zone 1 is the area which has a low probability of flooding and suitable for all land uses.

The proposed development of the site will not increase the impermeable surfacing at the site. It is proposed that on-site surface water will be intercepted by permeable paving and directed to attenuation prior to off-site discharge. Details of surface water drainage would be secured by condition.

It is not considered that the proposal would result in the risk of flooding to the site or to those neighbouring the site and therefore accords with policy CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and section 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

j) Contamination

An investigation into the potential for contamination of the site will be undertaken prior to development which would be secured by condition along with appropriate mitigation.

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 site lies within the City Centre Rivergate policy area where the principle of the hotel development is supported;
- The proposal would complement the offer of services and facilities for the city and bring economic benefits;
- The height, massing and design of the development would not adversely affect the setting of the Cathedral or the Old Customs House building and would represent an improvement;
- The site can be satisfactorily accessed by vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians;
- The site is within a sustainable location and the provision of car parking and cycle parking is considered to be acceptable therefore the proposal would not unduly impact upon the adjacent highway network;
- The appearance, layout and scale of the building is considered acceptable and will not result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area; and
- The proposal would not result in any significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

The development is therefore in accordance with Sections 12, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS4,, CS16, CS17, CS18 and CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy, Policies PP2, PP3, PP4, PP12, PP13, PP16 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy LP6, LP13, LP16, LP19 and LP48 of the Proposed Submission version of the new Peterborough Local Plan.

7 Recommendation

The case officer recommends that Planning Permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

- 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 No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority in writing. No demolition/development shall take place unless in complete accordance with the approved scheme. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full including any post development requirements e.g. archiving and submission of final reports.

Reason: To secure the obligation on the planning applicant or developer to mitigate the impact of their scheme on the historic environment when preservation in situ is not possible, in accordance with paragraphs 128 and 141 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). This is a pre-commencement condition because archaeological investigations will be required to be carried out before development begins.

- C 3 Notwithstanding the submitted information, no development shall take place above base course until details of the following materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Walling and roofing materials – samples shall be made available on site for inspection
- Windows and doors
- Rainwater goods
- Any externally visible sustainable technologies
- Any externally visible flues, vents or similar features

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 Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 4 No development other than demolition shall take place until a detailed design, in accordance with 'Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy (619327-MLM-ZZ-XX-RP-C-0001) and drawing number: 619327 MLM ZZ XX DR C 0110', and associated management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site using sustainable drainage methods has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved drainage system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved detailed design prior to the use of the building commencing.

Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal and in accordance with policy CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition as the details will need to be agreed prior to works commencing on site.

- C 5 Notwithstanding the submitted information, no development shall take place above base course until details of the finish and colour of the perimeter wall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include a sample panel of the treated brickwork which can be inspected on site. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter remain as such.

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance, in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 6 No development other than demolition, approved by this planning permission shall commence until a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. This strategy will include the following components:

1. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:

- all previous uses;
- potential contaminants associated with those uses;
- a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors; and
- potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.

2. A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.

3. The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.

4. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason To ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution in line with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- C 7 Prior to any part of the permitted development being occupied a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

Reason Should remedial work be required, to ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to human health or the water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete. This is in line with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- C 8 If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason To ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site in line with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- C 9 Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason A piling risk assessment should be provided if contaminants are identified during site investigation that may be mobilised towards the underlying Principal Aquifer if piling is proposed.

- C10 No building works which comprise the erection of a building required to be served by water services shall be undertaken in connection with any phase of the development hereby permitted until full details of a scheme including phasing, for the provision of mains foul sewage infrastructure on and off site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No building shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To prevent flooding, pollution and detriment to public amenity through provision of suitable water infrastructure.

- C11 Prior to the commencement of the development a construction management plan (CMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The CMP shall include:

- Haul routes to and from the site.
- The location of parking, turning, loading and unloading areas for construction vehicles.
- The location of storage compounds and welfare facilities.
- Wheel washing facilities capable of cleaning the wheels and underside of the chassis.
- Location of any temporary access points.
- Hours of work, including details of piling, if required.

- Construction delivery times (consideration should be given to limit the activity on the adjacent highway network during peak periods)
- Control and dust and noise

The information in the construction plan shall be adhered to throughout the entire construction period.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy PP12 adopted Planning Policies DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition because it is necessary to demonstrate that the development can be constructed without resulting in a detrimental impact on the adjacent highway.

- C12 Prior to the first occupation of the development the area shown for the purposes of parking/turning on drawing number DR-A-0001 P2 shall be provided. Such provision shall thereafter be retained for this purpose and not put to any other use.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy PP13 adopted Planning Policies DPD

- C13 The number of covered Sheffield stands must be increased as soon as occupancy levels regularly reach 75% in the case of 4 stands, or 80% in the case of 5 or more stands in accordance with details which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: In order to encourage sustainable modes of transport and in accordance with policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- C14 Prior to first occupation of the development a scheme of nesting boxes for birds shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall cater for a number of different species such as House Sparrow, Starling and Swift and shall include details of the number and design of boxes and their location. The boxes shall thereafter be implemented before the building is first occupied.

Reason: In the interests of the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policy CS21 of the adopted Core Strategy and policy PP16 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.

- C15 Prior to the installation of any external lighting the details including design, position, LUX levels and spill off site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The levels should not exceed the obtrusive light limitations for sky glow, light into windows, source intensity and building luminance specified in the Institution of Lighting Engineers document "Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution" (GN01:2011).

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation, and thereafter maintained as such.

The applicant is required to demonstrate compliance with this condition e.g. by measurement or calculation, in circumstances where reasonable concern arises from resultant lighting levels.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the area, in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS17 of the adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP3 and PP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

C16 No development other than demolition shall take place until a scheme for the hard or soft landscaping of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the following:-

- Proposed finished ground and building slab levels
- Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting
- Surfacing materials

The approved hard landscaping scheme shall be carried out, prior to the occupation of the development and the soft landscaping shall be carried out within the first available planting season following completion of the development or first occupation (whichever is the sooner) or alternatively in accordance with a timetable for landscape implementation which has been approved as part of the submitted landscape scheme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and then enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policy CS21 of the adopted Core Strategy and policy PP16 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.

C17 Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved the cycle parking shall be implemented in accordance with drg. no. DR-A -0001 Rev P2. The cycle stands shall be covered. The cycle parking area shall thereafter be retained for the purposes of cycle parking in connection with the development in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to encourage travel by sustainable modes in accordance with policy CS14 of the adopted Core Strategy.

C18 Prior to the commencement of development other than groundworks and foundations the details of the colour of the boundary wall shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. A sample panel shall be made available on site for inspection. The wall shall be finished in accordance with the approved details prior to the development being brought into use and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and in accordance with policy PP2 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

C19 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Noise Assessment (Reference 102343/MLM-ZZ-XX-RP-U-0001) and the mitigation measures detailed within Section 5.4 Tables 9 and 10 of the report. The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to the hotel being brought into use, and these mitigation measures shall thereafter be retained and maintained as such.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and in accordance with policy PP4 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policy DPD.

C20 No development shall take place other than demolition unless a scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing which specifies the provisions for mechanical ventilation ensuring compliance with the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 (including acoustic ventilation units incorporating fans for insertion in external walls) and the Approved Document F. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in accordance with policies PP2 and PP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policies CS16 and CS17 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

C21 No development other than demolition shall take place unless a scheme which specifies the provisions for attenuation of fixed mechanical plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The rating level of noise emitted from the site should not exceed 50 dB LAeq, 1 hour between 07:00hrs and 23:00hrs, and 34dB LAeq, 15 minutes at any other time. The noise levels should be determined at the nearest noise sensitive premises. The measurements and assessment should be made according to BS:4142:2014.

The attenuation measures shall be fully implemented prior to the hotel being brought into use, and these measures shall thereafter be retained and maintained as such.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in accordance with policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

C22 All ventilation of steam and cooking fumes to the atmosphere should be suitably filtered to avoid nuisance from smell, grease or smoke to persons in neighbouring or nearby properties. Details of the nature and location of any such filtration equipment should be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before installation and should be installed before the use of the premises commences, and thereafter maintained as such.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in accordance with policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

C23 Before any mechanical extract ventilation or plant associated with the control of steam and cooking fumes is installed on site, details of the proposed Sound Power Level (SWL) and frequency spectrum data for mechanical extract ventilation shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and will not be operated except in accordance with the approved scheme. The plant and/or mechanical extract ventilation shall be designed so it does not exceed the noise levels specified in Condition 21.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in accordance with policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

C24 The development shall be implemented in accordance with the following approved Plans:

- Site Location Plan
- Proposed elevations 01 drg. no. –SBA -XX-ZZ -DR-A -201 rev P2
- Proposed elevations 02 drg. no. SBA-XX-ZZ-DR-A 202 rev P2
- Proposed elevations 03 drg. no. SBA-XX-ZZ -DR-A -203 rev P3
- Visualisation 01 drg. no. SBA-DR-A-401 rev P3
- Proposed ground floor Plan drg. no. SBA -XX-00 -DR-A -0001 Rev P3
- Proposed first floor plan drg. no. –SBA -XX-01 -DR-A -0002 Rev P2
- Proposed second floor plan drg. no. - SBA -XX-02 -DR-A -0003 Rev P2
- Proposed roof plan drg. no. –SBA- XX-XX-DR-A -0005 Rev P2
- Proposed pedestrian route drg. no. –SBA -XX-XX-DR-A -0004 Rev P2
- Section AA drg. no. SBA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-0101 Rev P2
- Section BB and CC drg. no. SBA-XX-ZZ-DR- A-0102 Rev P2
- Topographical Survey drg. no. 16387 ea-01 Rev A
- Swept Path Analysis drg. no. TR01
- Flood risk and drainage strategy
- Noise Impact Assessment

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Copies to Councillors:

Mahboob Hussain
Amjad Iqbal
Mohammed Jamil

This page is intentionally left blank