

**Application Ref:** 21/00287/R3FUL

**Proposal:** Full application for the erection of a three storey building, car parking and associated works, infrastructure and landscaping for use as a research and development building as part of the University of Peterborough. Outline application (with all matters other than access and scale reserved) for the erection of a car park with capacity of up to 180 additional spaces, creation of a new access off Bishop's Road including the creation of a new access to the Regional Pool car park and closure of the existing access off Bishop's Road, and associated works, infrastructure and landscaping.

**Site:** Land at Bishops Road, Eastgate, Peterborough

**Applicant:** Peterborough R&D Property Company LTD  
**Agent:** Mr Rob Riding, Pegasus Group

**Site visit:** 10.03.21

**Referred by:** Executive Director of Place and Economy  
**Reason:** Significant level of public interest and wider concern

**Case officer:** Mrs Louise Simmonds  
**Telephone No.** 01733 45(01733) 454439  
**E-Mail:** louise.simmonds@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 application site is located within the identified Peterborough City Centre boundary and directly to the south of Bishops Road, a main route into the city centre from the east.

The site comprises three distinct areas: the former Wirrina surface public car park which is now the site of construction of Phase 1 of the University of Peterborough (granted planning permission under application reference 20/01044/R4FUL); the current Regional Pool surface car park comprising 200 spaces; and Bishops Park, an area of largely grassed public open space.

Both within and surrounding the site are a series of mature treed shelter belts which date to the time of the Development Corporation and are intrinsic to the character of the wider area south of Bishops Road. However none are subject to formal protection by way of a Tree Preservation Order.

Beyond Bishops Road to the north is the Bishops Creighton Primary School and residential properties in Stevenson Court, South Road and along Bishops Road. To the east is the Peterborough Regional Pool and beyond, further public open space. To the west is the Bishops Road surface car park adjacent to the Grade II Listed 'Lido'. To the south is Peterborough Sports/Athletics Ground, with the Embankment beyond, separated by a mature tree belt.

The site lies entirely within the identified Riverside North Policy Area of the Local Plan. It is not sited within any designated Conservation Areas, but is in close proximity to the City Centre CA and sits within the presence/setting of the Grade I Listed Cathedral and its Precincts.

## Proposal

The application is in hybrid form and seeks:

1) Full planning permission for the erection of a three storey building for research and development use associated with the University of Peterborough, known as Phase 2. This would be sited to the rear of the recently permitted and implemented Phase 1 planning permission, on the former Wirrina car park site. The proposal also includes associated car parking, works, infrastructure and landscaping; and

2) Outline planning permission with access and scale sought, and all other matters (appearance, landscaping and layout) reserved, for the construction of a decked car park for up to 180 additional vehicles (up to 380 in total), on the current Peterborough Regional Pool car park site. This also includes the creation of a new vehicular access off Bishops Road, and closure of the existing Regional Pool car park access, with associated works, infrastructure and landscaping.

It should be noted that the scheme has been amended from that which was originally submitted, to move the location of the proposed car park from the public open space within the red line boundary known as Bishops Park, to the Regional Pool car park. Whilst retained within the red line boundary, no development is proposed on Bishops Park.

## 2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
20/01044/R4FUL	Erection of three storey building and change of use of the land to form University, creation of vehicular access, car parking and associated infrastructure and landscaping	Permitted	12/11/2020
16/01948/R4FUL	Use as hand car-wash facility	Permitted	04/01/2017
09/00021/FUL	Continued use as a public car park	Permitted	28/04/2009
06/00840/FUL	Use of car park for car boot sales on Sundays and Bank Holiday Mondays - Retrospective	Permitted	20/07/2006
04/00719/FUL	Continued use as car park	Permitted	18/06/2004
03/01716/FUL	Demolition of building and erection of 60 bedroom hotel with 51 parking spaces.	Withdrawn by Applicant	25/02/2005
01/01152/OUT	Renewal of planning permission 96/P0605 for 120 bed hotel and conference centre with car parking	Withdrawn by Applicant	06/03/2003
01/00416/FUL	Three storey hotel with basement car park and conference centre and associated works	Withdrawn by Applicant	13/11/2002
97/01312/FUL	Renewal of planning permission 93/P0730 to continue use as motorcycle training and portacabins as office	Permitted	06/02/1998
94/P0863	Additional use for indoor second hand/antique fairs, jumble sales, one day sales, exhibitions and trade fairs	Permitted	01/03/1995
93/P0730	Change of use of land from car park/games court to motorcycle training (educational) (class D1) including stationing of two portacabins for office use (retrospective)	Permitted	07/12/1994

P1046/89	Erection of 150 bedroomed hotel and conference centre with car parking (outline) - application as amended by agent's letter of 28th September 1989 and accompanying drawings nos 88/20/13, 14 and 15	Permitted	30/11/1989
P1025/85	Erection of 134 bedroom hotel (outline)	Permitted	10/04/1986
P0614/81	Layout of all-weather roller hockey pitch	Permitted	23/07/1981
P0750/76	Layout of public open space including children's playground	Permitted	18/10/1976

### **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 pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

#### **National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)**

Paragraph 38 - Decision-making

Chapter 6 - Building a strong, competitive economy

Chapter 8 - Promoting healthy and safe communities

Chapter 9 - Promoting sustainable transport

Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Chapter 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Chapter 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Chapter 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

#### **Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (2019)**

LP4: Spatial Strategy for Employment, Skills and University Development

LP6: The City Centre - Overarching Strategy

LP13: Transport

LP16: Design and the Public Realm

LP17: Amenity Provision

LP19: The Historic Environment

LP22 Green Infrastructure Network

LP28: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

LP29: Trees and Woodland

LP32: Flood and Water Management

LP33: Development on Land Affected by Contamination

LP51: Riverside North Policy Area

#### **Peterborough Flood and Water Management SPD (2019)**

#### **Peterborough Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity SPD (2019)**

## 4 Consultations/Representations

### **PCC Peterborough Highways Services (19.05.21)**

No objections - With regards to the Phase 2 building, the location and scope have been discussed at length and while it is acknowledged that the new building will reduce the parking capacity for Phase 1 this will be offset by the proposed decked car parking to the east, subject to planning approval being granted. Recommend conditions relating to: a Construction Management Plan; temporary construction facilities; pre-condition highway survey; wheel wash; parking/turning in accordance with the submitted drawings; cycle parking in accordance with the submitted drawings; and submission of a Travel Plan.

With regards to the outline car park, the new location offers good connectivity directly onto Bishops Road while some motorists would potentially be able to use the one-way regional pool exit to further to the east. Some realignment of the public highway will be required to accommodate the new junction proposed. Recommend conditions relating to: a Construction Management Plan; temporary construction facilities; pre-condition highway survey; wheel wash; removal of the redundant Regional Pool car park access; and visibility splays.

### **PCC Travel Choice**

No comments received.

### **Peterborough Cycling Forum**

No comments received.

### **PCC Conservation Officer (07.04.21 and 11.05.21)**

No objections - The second phase university building will be discreetly tucked away between phase 1 and the dense tree belt of the embankment. Its height has been limited so as not to encroach into the very important views of the Cathedral from the Embankment. It has been shown within the heritage statement that there will be little to no harm on important views of the Cathedral from the embankment and only small sections will be visible above the tree belt.

The re-siting of the proposed decked car park on the existing regional pool car park will have significantly reduced impact on the most prominent locations and vantage points within the public realm and what is proposed to become the wider campus. The identified impacts on the high quality Cathedral views from Bishop's Road Park are no longer unacceptably impacted by this scheme. The indicative drawings show that the building line will be respected. Height parameters have been given, which do appear acceptable in terms of impact on Cathedral views and general urban design of the area.

A masterplan does remain a much anticipated accompaniment to the wider campus, in order to ensure that the site is given the best chance of success in its layout, appearance and urban design considerations.

### **Historic England (10.05.21)**

No objections - The proposed three-storey Research & Development building would not have a detrimental impact on views towards the Cathedral and Precinct.

The height of the car park would be a maximum of 19.60 AOD at parapet level, thereby matching the height of the adjacent recently approved Phase 1 University building. The scale of the building would no longer have a detrimental impact on views towards the east elevation of the Cathedral and Precinct.

Consider that the proposals now meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 194 and 196. In its revised location and configuration (on the Regional Pool Car Park), the decked car park element of the scheme would now be acceptable.

**PCC Archaeological Officer (04.05.21)**

No objections - The site of the Phase 2 building has witnessed a programme of archaeological investigations, including desk-based assessment, geophysical (GPR) survey and targeted evaluation by trial trenching. On the basis of the results from these investigations, no further archaeological work is deemed necessary.

The site of the proposed car park however has not been the subject of any archaeological fieldwork investigation. Therefore, further investigation is required owing to the high potential for buried heritage: geophysical survey; targeted evaluation by trial trenching informed by the results of the geophysical survey; and, subject to the results of the evaluation by trial trenching, monitoring of associated infrastructure and landscaping.

**The Gardens Trust (25.05.21)**

No comment - This does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.

**Peterborough Civic Society (10.05.21)**

Objection - The deletion of decked/multi storey car park on the area known as Bishop's Road Park is plainly welcomed as it addresses the Civic Society's principle objection to the application. The replacement proposal does not, however, make a great deal of sense because at this stage of the proposals for the campus, the retained existing surface car park has a capacity in excess of the 180 spaces required for Phases 1 and 2.

This application seeks outline permission for 180 spaces, partly in decked form on the northern half of the Regional Pool Car park. The number of decks is not specified but is assumed to be 2 levels for this phase of the scheme. The outline includes a parameter plan which would allow at least two additional floors to be built to a maximum height of about 12metres.

We consider that the commitment of this site to built development to be prejudicial to the overall development of the campus and that as the existing car park is adequate for phases 1&2 that there is no necessity for it at this stage. It may be necessary to specify, in the approval that the surface car park is for ARUP and Regional Pool use only.

It could well be that the campus will evolve in an easterly direction incorporating the RP Car Park and the Regional Pool site itself rather than to the south of Phase 1&2 site. The southwards direction of campus growth should not be taken as a given as it would encroach significantly onto an area covered by the Local Plan policies LP24 and LP51 regarding Nene Valley and the University. As such built development of this open space, other than along the frontage to Bishop's Road, would be a departure from the adopted Local Plan.

Yet again it demonstrates the pitfalls which may be encountered in allowing piecemeal development of the Embankment in advance of a Master Plan for the whole area.

On matters regarding the building itself our previously submitted comments have been slightly amended to reflect small changes made to the earlier application plans.

There is one overriding difficulty we have in assessing the proposal for the Phase 2 building and that is: how to form a meaningful opinion in the absence of an overall plan for the campus. It is apparent that the ARUP Embankment campus will, in the not too distant future, consist of a number of teaching faculties in linked, but detached building blocks. The creation of attractive urban spaces which not only work well for all who use them but which bring something of beauty, architectural quality and organisational clarity to this part of the city is of paramount importance. The Phase 2 block together with its companion building, Phase 1 does not achieve this aim and, in truth it is difficult to see how it could do so in the absence of any definite indication, in the drawings and written information available to us, of the further phases.

There is also ambiguity in the scheme regarding the circulation structure, of the way people move about the campus. Is there a main concourse? If so, does it run north-south or east-west? The main entrance to Phase 1 block is located in the south-west corner of the building whereas the

main entrance to Phase 2 is in its north-east corner at the opposite end of the rectangular space created by the two blocks. The deletion of a secondary access on the north-west corner of the block indicates that this eastern approach is the main focus of access to Phase 2, which seems to favour the service road access as the more significant of the east and west approaches. Does the campus have a 'front door'?

Further muddying of the water comes from the outline application proposal of additional car parking provision in the form of a decked car-park on the existing Regional Pool car-park. If this came about there would be a further strengthening of the east-to west flow of people through the site and the 'back-door' approach to the campus would become the dominant one.

These issues of bland urban form and an incoherent movement pattern would, and should, be addressed in a master plan for the campus. We urge that one be produced as a matter of urgency, although ideally it should itself be done, hand-in-hand, with the emerging Master Plan for the whole Embankment land.

On more detailed matters; the service road to the east of the blocks should have better provision for pedestrians. The provision of a bus stop on Bishop's Road is very much appreciated, although it would be useful to see this shown on the site plan together with a footpath from the bus stop to the main entrance to Block 2. The assumption that it would be near the service road access adds weight to the desirability of enhancing footway access along the service road. The footpath on the east side of the service road is interrupted by a sub-station compound leaving the relatively narrow path on the west side to cope with all foot traffic. This should be improved.

On the subject of accesses to Bishop's Road; the outline application makes it clear that vehicular access to the Regional Pool, its car-park and the decked car park will be consolidated into a single access road, with the existing exit only road retained as such. We support this arrangement but have concerns about the layout of the junction on Bishops Road. It lies on the centre of a double bend and has no provision for right-turn lane into the site for traffic from the west. This is a fairly sharp double bend and there is the added hazard of the access to South Street to contend with. We feel that a more comprehensive design for this main access which serves multiple functions is required.

In summary; although the Civic Society has no objections to the height, scale, form and siting of the Phase 2 building and its landscaping, it has significant reservations about how it fits in with the overall structure of a completed campus and would like to see some form of master plan which may serve to allay these reservations.

However, the Civic Society objects to the outline application part of this hybrid application for the decked car park and access junction on the grounds that the upper floor or floors of the car park are not required by the development as proposed at this stage and approval would unnecessarily constrain options for further development of the University Campus.

#### **PCC Pollution Team (20.05.21)**

No objections - Owing to the size of the development, Air Quality must be considered. The submitted Air Quality Assessment is not accepted, as it appears to assess the impact of the current proposal in isolation to Phase 1, and cumulative impacts must be taken into account. Nonetheless, a revised assessment could be secured by way of a condition, alongside any mitigation that may be required.

With regards to internal noise, the submitted Noise Assessment demonstrates that acceptable levels would be achieved internally provided that the layout were open plan. This would not be the case if internal subdivision were to take place. A condition may be secured to address this.

Noise impacts to nearby residential premises may be controlled through a series of conditions. An overall noise limit of 49dB LAeq (1hr) between 07.00hrs and 23.00hrs and 35dB LAeq (15mins) at all other times should be secured in relation to the Phase 2 building. Thereafter, all

plant/equipment to be installed should demonstrate compliance (individually and cumulatively) against this overarching limit.

Finally, the Phase 2 contamination investigation results are accepted for the Phase 2 building - no remediation is required. A condition securing investigation and, where necessary remediation, for the Regional Pool car park is required.

**PCC Wildlife Officer (24.05.21)**

No objections - The changes to the proposal in terms of the siting of the proposed car park reduce the overall potential negative impact the proposal will have on ecological constraints. This has resulted in no longer requiring pre-determination bat surveys on trees.

As the predicted loss of habitat is now very minor, on-site biodiversity net gain can now be achieved. There are still several recommendations to account for the loss of habitat within the Ecological Assessment which need recommended methodology and lines of responsibility providing.

**Natural England (19.03.21)**

No objections - the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites or landscapes.

**PCC Open Space Officer (14.05.21)**

No objection - Welcome that the proposed car park siting has been revised such that no development is now proposed on Bishops Park.

**PCC Tree Officer (12.05.21)**

No objections - Welcome the relocation of the outline element of the proposal and accept this. No objections with regards to the Phase 2 element. Request conditions securing the measures set out in the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement, and a detailed landscaping scheme.

**The Wildlife Trusts (Cambridgeshire)**

No comments received.

**Lead Local Drainage Authority (18.05.21)**

No objections - Request a compliance condition to secure the submitted surface water drainage strategy in relation to the full element of the proposal. Request a condition securing a full surface water drainage scheme in relation to the outline element of the proposal.

**Environment Agency (30.04.21 and 17.03.21)**

No objections - Whilst the submitted ground investigation reports do not cover the entirety of the application site, based on the available information, satisfied that the site poses a low risk to controlled waters. Recommend that a condition relating to unsuspected contamination be secured.

**North Level District Internal Drainage Board**

No comments received.

**Police Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO) (10.03.21)**

No objections - As with Phase 1, this Office continues to discuss with our counter terrorism colleagues any aspects of the design and layout that cause a concern. The Design and Access Statements are quite clear on the high level of security that this building and the surrounding area will have and that is encouraging. A Secured by Design application for the Phase 2 build has been submitted. More than happy to continue that discussion regarding the decked car park area and the boundary treatments for the site including footpaths and green spaces.

**Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service**

No comments received.

## **PCC Waste Management**

No comments received.

## **Local Residents/Interested Parties**

Initial consultations: 578 including a press advert and 3no. site notices

Total number of responses: 111

Total number of objections: 109

Total number in support: 0

Three rounds of public consultation have taken place on the application: the first in relation to the original submission, which included the proposed car park being sited on Bishops Park; and the second and third following revision to the siting such that it is now proposed on the Regional Pool car park.

It should be noted that, at the time of writing this report, the third consultation (which corrected an omission from the description of development) remains outstanding. This will largely be completed by the time of the Committee Meeting, insofar as the time period set out on the site notices and neighbour letters will have concluded (on 10 June). However, the press advert will not expire until 17 June, 2 days following the meeting. In light of this, Officers will be seeking delegated authority to allow this consultation period to close following Members resolution.

### **First Round**

A total of 109no. letters of objection were received raising the following (albeit it should be noted that the majority related to the proposed car park):

#### **Principle of development**

- Loss of a well-loved green space
- A university together with research facilities would be better suited placed together further away from the centre on land that has the potential for future expansion and development.
- Loss of green space in an area where there is already a lack of green spaces.
- Loss of the play area is tragic. Is an alternative going to be built?
- Parks and green spaces in this area are vital for the local community.
- This Green Space is not underused land, this is, and always has been, Bishop's Park, a valuable open space enjoyed by residents, dog walkers and exercise clubs alike
- There are other more appropriate locations for the proposed car park
- Too much open space to be lost by the University and football stadium
- Makes no sense when the market car park was demolished and could be rebuilt
- Welcome the University but feel that reuse of some of the many redundant and underused buildings in the City Centre would be more appropriate
- Parks are vital for children's health, they should not be lost

#### **Design and visual amenity**

- City Council is very short-sighted to develop the river front of the city centre. This natural and most beautiful area should have been the jewel in the crown of the city that had the potential to make Peterborough a place that visitors would have wanted to visit for recreation and otherwise with the right development. Instead the council in their wisdom decided to cram the area full of high-rise accommodation and other unsightly buildings thereby ruining the whole aesthetics of the riverfront.
- Proposed car park would be an eyesore and harm the skyline
- Loss of beautiful open space.
- Potential for increased crime.
- Will be the equivalent of having a 4 deck concrete cruise liner moored 25 metres from our homes in this residential area within a stone's throw of the historic Peterborough Cathedral precincts
- The proposal would allow little scope for landscaping, and extra tree planting would take years



- to provide cover and privacy for residents
- Peterborough is becoming a jungle of car parks
- The iconic views of Bishops Rd Park should be preserved for the future generations
- The buildings will impede the Cathedral view from visitors to the Embankment
- The view of the Cathedral will be lost

#### Neighbour amenity

- Loss of views from properties along Bishops Road
- Loss of natural light
- Overlooking from the proposed car park to properties along Bishops Road and loss of privacy
- Additional pollution from increased cars
- Noise pollution
- Must not give up our whole neighbourhood to this University plan
- Loss of air quality
- Increased light pollution
- Erecting this multi-storey will not benefit the health of anyone and especially not those living in the houses opposite and close by
- A semi-enclosed concrete space of that size would reflect and amplify sound waves, acting like a giant speaker. A 24hr car park, operating through the night, when ambient sound levels are relatively low, would seriously disturb local residents' quality of sleep
- Proposal would go against the Peterborough and Cambridgeshire Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy, taking away precious green space which provides precious mental and emotional and physical benefits to those in the surrounding area

#### Highways

- Increased congestion worsening existing traffic problems along Bishops Road
- Lack of highway infrastructure to support the development
- Together with the proposed new slip road from Fletton Parkway and the New Football Stadium, the increase in traffic volume will have inestimable consequences
- Extra traffic will harm the safety of the school children in the nearby school
- Why not consider a park and ride?
- Increased risk of accidents from the additional vehicular movements
- Despite complaining to Parking "Services" for over 20 years, the parking around here is just as bad - the only "improvement" PCC ever made was to turn the area into a Residents Only Zone so they could start charging people for the "privilege" of parking outside their own home while doing nothing whatsoever to actually earn the money by way of sending traffic wardens to patrol on anything like a regular basis
- Significant concern about the resultant impact on the current levels of traffic congestion at drop-off and pick-up times. We believe this could ultimately result in safety issues for our children, families, and staff
- The only vehicle access to the academy is via South Street then Granby Street, both busy residential streets. We (Bishops Creighton School) fear that with significant additional traffic this car park is going to produce in the immediate vicinity of the South Street junction could create a significant risk to those travelling to and from the academy. We believe therefore that an alternative entrance option needs to be developed to mitigate this increased risk, as might the development of an alternative entrance option for the academy
- Have the potential problem of this car park being used for non-university students on match day and with Christmas shoppers, as it's not that far away walk from town when nearer car parks are full which then mean off road parking near the car park which could cause unfair disruption to Bishops Road residents
- Cambridge is a good example of a city that has an extensive university, but does not allow the undergraduates to have cars on campus. This policy protects the historic green spaces and charm of Cambridge, reduces the carbon footprint of the university and motivates students to use non harmful transport methods, such as cycling and walking. Suggest that Peterborough could adopt a similar policy

#### Public consultation

- All applications and development should be stopped until the public have been consulted about what is happening to their areas (this proposed development & the embankment area)
- Unable to view documents on the website so unable to comment fully
- Lack of meaningful consultation with residents on the plans for the University as a whole
- The Council are rushing through plans without proper consultation under the cover of Covid, when people are finding it difficult to get their voices heard
- Why such a short period to comment?
- The plans have been fairly hard to access during the lockdown. Many neighbours have found it difficult to access and search the planning documents, as well as not even realizing they can have a say in this
- Original plans put forward did not include a 400 space car park
- The only people who were sent letters of planning application appears to have been those on Bishops road - yet the people it serves covers the whole of the Eastgate community. Was this just another way of trying to minimise any objections?
- Signage regarding this notice is poor - a person can't quite see the signs when it's written in a small font cable tied to a lamp post. The fact that it's written means people need to be able to read. What if a blind person uses the space and is unaware of the decisions being made regarding it? You haven't really been inclusive regarding the audience this notice has been intended for

### Drainage

- For 40 years there has been a flooding problem in Bishops Road. Now a recently created soak-away - intended to mitigate the problem - is causing the field to flood in addition to the road. Where will all this water go if the project goes ahead?
- Proposed drainage would be a sticking plaster and would result in flooding of Bishop's Park
- The land and the road regularly flood, covering the road completely

### Other matters

- Unable to find the location of the vehicular access for the proposed car park
- Lack of a cohesive plan for this area and the embankment area
- Would definitely fight the Council in the courts for an equitable settlement
- We have to lead by example when it comes to climate change
- Harm to local wildlife
- Concerns that this multi storey car park going to end up a white elephant. This car park will also require maintenance and is it feasible to think that students will be able to afford the car park. As, in time car park fees will increase, on the back of this the car park will become unused, unloved and forgotten
- Multi storey car parks have a habit of attracting suicide, is this really what you're looking for with kids walking to and from school?
- The car park plans are very vague, with only a yellow box illustrating the overall size and position, but lacking many important details
- Believe a new and updated Bat survey should be undertaken as 10 months have passed since the last environmental report

In addition, a change.org petition of 136no. signatories was received in objection to the proposal.

### Second and third rounds

A total of 5no. further objections were received raising the following:

- Increased noise and pollution from additional car movements
- Do not see how moving the car park will reduce traffic congestion etc. along with other issues raised in first objection
- Note that there are plans to demolish the Regional Swimming Pool. On the back of this, what plans do you have in place to replace what is there now?
- All that has changed is the number of car parking spaces. The proposal is still to replace a public green area, Bishop's Park, with a car park, and whether single storey or multi storey this is still a negative step for the area and the city as a whole

- Loss of green space is unacceptable
- Why can an underground car park not be considered?

## **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
- Heritage
- Access, parking and highway implications
- Drainage and flood risk
- Neighbour amenity
- Ecology and trees
- Contamination
- Air quality

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

As detailed in Section 1 above, both elements of the proposal relate to the University of Peterborough and follow from Phase 1 which was granted planning permission in 2020 under application reference 20/01044/R4FUL. Construction has begun on this earlier phase, with opening of this building scheduled for September 2022.

The research and development building proposed (Phase 2) would be occupied by an anchor tenant, Photocentric, who will take circa one third of the space of the building, with the remaining space set out as flexible space for research and development use (end users are not yet identified). The car park is proposed to be owned and operated by the City Council, and would not be limited solely for use of the University albeit it is proposed as mitigation for the Phase 2 building (discussed in section (d) below).

The application site is located within the identified Riverside North Policy Area of the City Centre. Policy LP4 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) states that '...in principle, development proposals which directly assist in creating a thriving, independent, campus based university , with an undergraduate population of 12,500 students by 2035 will be supported. A new university campus could be included within the Riverside North Policy Area...'.

The proposed development would continue the redevelopment of the former Wirrina car park, and would maximise car parking on the present Regional Pool surface car park. The research and development building represents development that is associated, and is exclusively for the expansion of the University of Peterborough whilst the car park is proposed to support this development and ensure that the city centre has adequate parking capacity to accommodate it without undue impact to the surrounding public highway network through inappropriate parking.

Policy LP51 refers to the provision of some development within the Riverside North Policy Area including the provision of a University of Peterborough campus. Whilst it is noted that there is an indicated allocated area for the university within the Local Plan policies map, this is indicative only. The vision and intention of the policies for the Riverside North Policy Area seek the location of the University on the Bishops Road frontage/to the northernmost section of the area known as the Embankment. The application site for both elements of the proposal is situated along the northern boundary of the Riverside North Policy Area, adjacent to Bishops Road. Therefore, the proposal is fully in line with this.

Furthermore, the proposal represents the effective reuse of previously developed, brownfield land with a high quality, landmark development. The proposal would continue the process of regenerating and enhancing this part of the City Centre, with a development of benefit not just to the City but the wider area surrounding Peterborough. This would be not only through the expansion of the university, but the creation of important R&D premises for the creation and expansion of local business.

In addition to the above, paragraph 94 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) advises that great weight should be afforded to the need to create new education facilities. The proposal represents the second phase in the creation of the University of Peterborough, and reinforces the anchor for a wider University campus. Such development would be to the significant benefit of the residents of Peterborough and its surroundings, delivering expansion of a new higher education facility which will directly encourage and promote economic development.

As such, the development is considered to be acceptable in principle, and in accordance with Policies LP4 and LP51 of the Local Plan (2019) subject to satisfactory assessment against the following matters.

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

Turning first to the full element of the proposal, the Phase 2 building has been designed to introduce a further 3 storey building immediately to the south (rear) of the Phase 1 development. The building would be arranged over three storeys and have a gross internal floor area of approximately 3,300sqm, whilst the footprint would extend to approximately 1,200sqm. The siting has been carefully considered to maximise development of the former Wirrina car park, ensuring direct links between the Phase 1 building and the proposal. The large area of planned open landscaped space to the west of the buildings would be retained, with a landscaped concourse created between the two buildings providing soft landscaping, access and covered cycle parking which is accessible to users of both buildings.

The building height would align with the height of the Phase 1 teaching building, standing at approximately 13.3m high to the parapet. There would be two taller sections comprising: a plant enclosure (for flues); and a plant enclosure and stairwell/lift shaft overrun.

The form of the building is relatively simple, of regular shape and form and with a flat roof design. It would comprise of a predominantly glazed base area, with the building's mass broken up by a mixture of cladding, glazing to the upper floors. The main entrance is proposed to the west, mirroring that of Phase 1 and the linkage to the wider city centre, expressed by a recessed sheltered arrival space and a formal forecourt. Whilst materials are to be finalised (and secured by condition), it is anticipated that these will be of a high quality palette to mirror and reflect those approved and to be used on the Phase 1 building.

It is considered that the overall form and design of the Phase 2 building both reflects and respects the design approach of Phase 1 and will enhance the appearance and visual amenity of the University campus. The proposal would not appear unduly dominant or obtrusive, and would further reinforce the stature of the University within the City. The soft landscaping proposed would continue the overall approach secured as part of the Phase 1 development, acting both as an amenity tool, biodiversity enhancement and sustainable drainage system, and would aid in softening the appearance of the development within its surroundings.

Turning next to the proposed car park, this is proposed in outline only. Access and scale are sought in detail, with the matters of appearance, landscaping and layout reserved for later consideration. The application has been accompanied by a series of parameter plans to indicate the scale of the car park. For clarity, this is now proposed on the Regional Pool car park site, and not on Bishops Park. Scale parameters indicate that the building would be sited no further forwards towards Bishops Road than the Phase 1 building, and would stand to a maximum three storey height to mirror Phase 1 (parapet height of 19.6 AOD with localised incidental height increases such as stairwell overruns to 22.3 AOD).

Given the prominence of the siting of the proposed car park, it is acknowledged and understood by Officers that a high quality of design would be required to ensure that the high standards of design that have been secured to date are maintained and reinforced.

Whilst landscaping is to be secured as a reserved matter for later consideration, an indicative

layout and landscaping proposal has accompanied the application. This indicates that the decked car park would be located in line with the Phase 1 building, with soft landscaping/attenuation basin features to the frontage with Bishops Road and a surface level car park to the rear. Whilst indicative only, this design is considered appropriate and demonstrates that the level of development proposed can be accommodated without appearing cramped or harmful to the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

Overall it is considered that the proposed design is of high quality that would enhance the site and its wider surroundings, in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

### **c) Heritage**

#### *Above-ground heritage assets*

The application site sits in the shadow and surroundings of the Grade I Listed Cathedral and its Precincts, which also contain Scheduled Ancient Monuments. In addition, it is sited in close proximity to the City Centre Conservation Area and the Grade II listed Lido. Therefore, the impact of the proposal upon the significance of these heritage assets is a key consideration.

Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) require that special regard be paid to the desirability of protecting listed buildings and their settings, and also to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. This is further reinforced through the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which states that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets.

Significance is one of the guiding principles in relation to assessing the impact of proposals upon the historic environment, and is defined in the NPPF as 'the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest'. Such interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic, and it may derive not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.

The Cathedral and its Precincts, form a place of exceptional architectural, archaeological and historic significance, and is a remarkably consistent work of 12<sup>th</sup> century architecture, including an especially important Nave ceiling of c.1220. Its prominence within the City, as one of the tallest structures, contributes to its significance, as do key views of it from surrounding vantage points. Two such points relate to the application site, both of which are the only views of the lesser seen east end. With regards to the Grade II listed Lido, its setting contributes to its significance, but this is largely in relation to the manicured gardens within its immediate environs, with mature treed shelterbelts forming a backdrop and physical separation.

Historic England and the Gardens Trust are the statutory consultees in matters affecting heritage assets of the stature of the Cathedral, and Historic England initially raised objection to the car park element of the proposal (when it was to be sited on Bishops Park). Following revision to the proposal, to site the car park on the Regional Pool car park site, they have removed their objection and advised that the proposed development would not cause harm to the setting of nearby designated heritage assets. The Gardens Trust have raised no objection either. Further to this and in similar vein, the Council's Conservation Officer raises no objection to the revised proposal.

Turning first to the full element of the proposal, Historic England has advised that, as this would be sited between the Phase 1 building (to the north) and an existing tree shelter belt, no harm would be caused to important views towards the Cathedral and Precinct from the embankment. The proposal would stand at the same height as the Phase 1 building, and the relationship of this in terms of the setting of the Cathedral and other heritage assets has already been accepted. The proposal would not worsen this impact, and it has been shown in visuals contained within the submitted heritage statement, that only small sections would be visible above the tree belt. As the City Centre Conservation Area (CA) lies beyond the Cathedral, given that the impact upon the latter is accepted, the same position is adopted for the CA. With regards to the Lido, it is considered that there is sufficient separation to the proposal with vegetation screening retained

such that they development would not erode the Lido's setting, or compete with it in terms of architectural significance.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would preserve and result in no harm to the significance of the Cathedral and its Precincts, and the listed Lido, and no harm would result to the character or appearance of the City Centre CA.

With regards to the outline element, concern was initially raised by both Historic England and the Conservation Officer in terms of the harm to the significance of the Cathedral from the proposed siting of the car park on Bishops Road through the loss of an important view. Following this, and the significant level of public concern expressed, the scheme has been revised to reposition the car park on the Regional Pool car park. The submitted parameters plans indicate that the building would be no taller or sited closer to Bishops Road than the Phase 1 building.

Historic England has advised that the revised siting and parameters provided would ensure that the car park would not form a prominent feature. Further, the Conservation Officer has advised that the revised siting would have a significantly reduced impact upon the most prominent locations and vantage points of the Cathedral within the public realm. Given that the proposed car park would not result in the loss of or harm to any key views of the east end of the Cathedral, would stand at the same height as the Phase 1 building, and the relationship of this in terms of the setting of the Cathedral and other heritage assets has already been accepted through the granting of planning permission (20/01044/R4FUL), it is considered that the proposed car park would not cause harm to the significance of the Cathedral and Precincts.

As with the impacts arising from the full element of the proposal, given that the City Centre CA lies beyond the Cathedral, it is not considered that harm to its character or appearance would result. Furthermore, the car park would be separated from the Lido by virtue of the Phase 1 and 2 buildings, whose relationship has been considered acceptable earlier in this section and consequently, it is considered that no harm would result to its significance in this instance.

On this basis, the full and outline elements of the proposal would ensure that the significance of nearby designated heritage assets are preserved and accordingly, the proposal is in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraphs 193, 194 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

#### Archaeology

The area of the application site upon which the Phase 2 full development is proposed has already witnessed a programme of archaeological investigations, including desk-based assessment, geophysical (GPR) survey and targeted evaluation by trial trenching. On the basis of the results from these investigations, the City Council's Archaeologist has advised that no further archaeological work is deemed necessary.

However, the Regional Pool car park upon which the outline element of the proposal is sought, has not been subject to such extensive investigations. This area has been subject to a desk-based assessment, it has not been the subject of any archaeological fieldwork investigation and, based upon the findings from the trial trenching on the Wirrina car park site, such investigation is necessary due to the potential for significant finds.

Accordingly, a condition is considered necessary to secure a Geophysical survey, targeted evaluation by trial trenching and, subject to the results of that evaluation, monitoring of associated infrastructure and landscaping. This would be in the form of a pre-commencement condition to ensure no works result in unacceptable harm to potential buried heritage assets.

Subject to the imposition of such a condition, the proposal would not harm any buried heritage assets of key importance, in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

#### **d) Access, parking and highway implications**

Whilst the application is in hybrid form, with the proposed car park sought at outline stage only, the two elements are intrinsically linked with the car park providing parking mitigation associated with the Phase 2 building. The application has been accompanied by a detailed Transport Assessment (TA) which sets out the traffic and highway implications arising from the development as a whole. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has accepted this TA and considers that it is a sound and reasonable assessment of the likely highway impacts arising from the development.

#### Parking

As part of consideration of Phase 1 of the University (20/01044/R4FUL), it was accepted that the car parking capacity of the City Centre would only just meet the demands generated, with some degree of overspill anticipated (45 cars) during peak periods from year 3 of operation onwards. Therefore, it has always been accepted and anticipated that any further development associated with the University would need to secure additional parking capacity.

The full element of the proposal, for the Phase 2 R&D building, would extend to a floor area of some 3,300sqm. As detailed above, approximately one third of this space is to be taken by Photocentric a Peterborough-based company, with the remaining building space tenants to be confirmed. Photocentric have confirmed that the building will house 63 full-time equivalent employees (60 of whom will be transferred from existing facilities within Fengate) and travel behaviour information for the staff transferring to the site has been used to inform the TA. For the remaining floor space, industry accepted travel modal patterns have been used.

Taking account of the proposed floorspace, the parking demand generated by the Phase 2 building would be 99no. spaces. 6no. of those would be provided within the immediate environs of the building (proposed as part of the full application) whilst the remaining are proposed to be accommodated within the car park which forms the outline element of the proposal. In addition, the Phase 2 building would result in the reconfiguration of the on-site parking area secured as part of Phase 1 and an overall reduction in the number of cars that can be parked on-site by 35. These lost spaces must therefore be re-provided.

Based upon the modelling set out within the submitted TA, it is evident that all of the above parking provision is required within 6 months of first occupation of the Phase 2 building.

The proposed car park is sought in outline form and would provide for up to 180 additional parking spaces above and beyond the existing Regional Pool car park (which has 200 spaces). As such, the total parking provision on the Regional Pool car park site would be 380 spaces. The 180 additional spaces would result in a level of car parking that would exceed the requirement for the Phase 2 building alone. The Applicant has allowed for the possibility of this larger capacity to include the 43 space shortfall from the Phase 1 development. It should be noted however that accommodating the parking shortfall from Phase 1 is not necessary to make this current proposed Phase 2 development acceptable, and therefore the Local Planning Authority cannot insist that all 180 additional spaces are built. Only 128 additional spaces are required for the proposed Phase 2 development and therefore it is this number which will be required as a minimum. However Officers consider that the provision of up to 180 additional spaces, despite being more than is required for either Phase 1 or Phase 2, is not unacceptable in this instance and given the lost parking through redevelopment of the Worrina car park.

The level of parking proposed is considered appropriate and a condition is required which secures the completion/opening of the proposed car park (which should include no less than 128 spaces) no later than 12 months following first use of the Phase 2 building. Without such a condition, parking demand would result which cannot safely be accommodated and which would result in an unacceptable impact upon the surrounding network through inappropriate parking. This will mean that any reserved matters submission will have to be submitted and determined bearing this ultimate deadline in mind.

Whilst it is noted that the proposed car park would not solely be for the use of the University,

operating as a general public car park by the City Council, this is not considered unacceptable. The proposal seeks to enhance the overall city centre parking offer to accommodate the development proposed, and during those times at which the University is not open, would be available for wider use by visitors to the City Centre.

#### Traffic generation

The submitted TA has identified that there are junctions within the locality of the application site which are presently operating at close to capacity and which would, come 2026 be at over capacity (without taking into account either Phases 1 or 2 of the University) - principally the Bishops Road/Vineyard Road mini roundabout and the A15 Rivergate roundabout. The modelling undertaken as part of the TA identifies that these junctions would be subject to some additional capacity issues, albeit the increase would be negligible and therefore not unacceptable. This view is accepted by the LHA.

There is one junction that presently would still have capacity in 2026 and 2031 (without Phases 1 and 2) - Junction 5 of the Fletton Parkway (Boongate). The modelling submitted identifies that following the construction of Phase 1 and taking account of the current proposal, the capacity would be exceeded. This is noted and is accepted as being an undue impact, however the 'on the ground' result would equate to a further 3 cars in the queue at the PM peak on the northbound parkway spur which is not considered to be wholly unacceptable. Further, as part of the Council's wider Embankment Area Access Study and Local Transport Plan, plans are being progressed to increase capacity of this junction as it is acknowledged that much of the planned development within the City Centre would result in the same impact. Unfortunately, the planning for this improvement work is not at a stage whereby a scheme has been finalised and therefore, it is not possible at this time, for Officers to seek a financial contribution as it would not meet the relevant legal tests for doing so. However, the Applicant has been advised that any future phases of the university will need to include contributions to this improvement work and, if necessary, bring forward the plans alongside any future applications.

Finally, the submitted TA has demonstrated that the implementation of a robust and comprehensive Travel Plan would likely mitigate these impacts through the encouragement of travel by means other than private car. This Plan would be a fully committed to by the Higher Education provider and closely monitored by PCC.

The NPPF, paragraph 109, clearly states that development proposals should only be refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The submitted TA has demonstrated that the residual cumulative impacts would not be severe, and the LHA has not raised any concerns with regards to highway safety.

#### Access

The full element of the proposal seeks to use the vehicular access granted planning permission through 20/01044/R4FUL (Phase 1). This access, and the internal roads/service areas within the development, have been fully tracked and it has been demonstrated that the site is capable of being safely serviced by large vehicles which can enter, turn and exit in a forward gear. The access has previously be found to be safe by the LHA and the current proposal would not alter this.

Turning to the outline element, access is sought at this time and therefore detailed drawings and proposals have been submitted. The proposal seeks to close the existing vehicular access to the Regional Pool car park and alter the current access serving the Regional Pool/Athletics Track service road. Presently, this junction is a 'Y' junction, whilst the proposal seeks a standard priority-controlled 'T-junction'. The new junction will serve the Regional Pool car park/current proposal, the Regional Pool and the Athletics Track, and will allow vehicles to both enter and exit. Access arrangements to the Regional Pool and the Athletics Track will be retained, including the retention of the one-way system and the exit only junction onto Bishop's Road, situated to the north of the Regional Pool.



The LHA has advised that this access would be of sufficient width, and provide adequate vehicle-to-vehicle visibility such that it would be safe. Some realignment of Bishops Road is likely to be required and as such, the LHA has requested that a condition securing a scheme be appended. This is considered to be reasonable and necessary.

#### Bus stops

As part of the Phase 1 development (20/01044/R4FUL), temporary bus stops have been secured on Bishops Road in order to encourage trips to/from the University by bus. Officers, and the LHA, have always been clear that any future phases beyond the current application, would need to ensure that a more permanent solution with regards to bus travel is secured however for the current proposal those temporary stops are considered adequate.

#### Cycle parking

As part of the full element of the proposal, 54 no. cycle parking spaces are proposed. This is based upon a standard of 1 stand per 90sqm for staff, and 1 stand per 200sqm for visitors. This would mainly be provided within the concourse area between the Phase 1 and Phase 2 buildings, continuing the line of cycle parking shelters already permitted under 20/01044/R4FUL (Phase 1). This location is considered appropriate and suitable, with adequate natural surveillance for security purposes. It is considered that this level of parking is appropriate for the proposed use, and accords with the Council's adopted standards.

#### Suggested LHA conditions

The LHA has requested that a number of conditions be secured on both the full and outline proposals. Broadly, these are considered by Officers to be reasonable and necessary however some are not. The LPA is moving away from securing onerous Construction Management Plans on many sites, as these largely duplicate other legislation which planning should not seek to do. In regards to this particular site, it is not considered to be sensitive in terms of traffic movements and therefore a detailed CMP is not felt to be necessary. This was the position also taken in regards to the Phase 1 permission (20/01044/R4FUL) whereby only wheel wash facilities were conditioned and it is proposed by Officers that the same is necessary for these elements. Similarly, the LHA has requested that a pre-condition highway survey be secured by condition. However, again, this is not considered necessary as it damage to the highway is covered by the Highway Act. Such a survey was not secured as part of the Phase 1 permission and in light of this, the LHA has subsequently removed this request. Finally, the LHA has requested temporary facilities for the site compound be secured. This may not be possible within the confines of the application site however the City Council (who are joint developer) will be able to provide adequate temporary facilities on other land owned such that no undue impact to highway safety results.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the proposal would not result in a severe impact to the capacity of the surrounding public highway network such that a reason for refusal could be sustained, safe access would be afforded to all users, and adequate parking provision would be made to meet the demands arising from the Phase 2 development. Further and notwithstanding this, it is considered that the benefit arising from the enhanced University offer and employment floorspace to the economy of the City and wider region, outweighs the limited harm that would result. On this basis, it is considered that the proposal accords with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 109 of the NPPF (2019).

### **e) Drainage and flood risk**

#### Surface water

Turning first to the Phase 2 building, a substantial green roof element is proposed to intercept a large proportion of rainfall. Thereafter, any surface water will discharge into a series of swales/basins located to the south and west of the site, before entering the Anglian Water sewer via a flow control unit. This is a continuation of the Phase 1 drainage strategy, albeit they are not linked systems. For the remaining development included within the full element of the application, surface water from hardstanding areas will flow into raingardens and tree pits prior to entering the

main drainage and attenuation system, and the small car parking areas and access roads adjoining the building are proposed to be formed of porous construction.

It is proposed that the eventual rate of discharge into the Anglian Water sewer would be no greater than greenfield run-off rate (including a 1 in 100 year flood event plus climate change) and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has accepted this. A pre-planning application was made by the Applicant to Anglian Water, who confirmed that this was accepted. Unfortunately no formal comments have been received from Anglian Water as part of this application, as those comments which were submitted related to a different site and no further response has been forthcoming.

With regards to the car park proposal, which is in outline at this stage, an illustrative surface water drainage proposal has been submitted. It is proposed that surface water would discharge into a series of under-drained swales located at the building perimeter before discharging to a detention basin located to the north of the site along Bishops Road, prior to entering the Anglian Water sewer via a flow control unit. Hardstanding areas adjacent to the car park structure would utilise porous paving wherever possible. Anglian Water has confirmed the principle of accepting a connection based upon the discharge rate proposed of 2 litres per second.

It has not been possible to undertake a site investigation within the Regional Pool car park site and therefore infiltration rates and groundwater levels have been based on investigations undertaken at the adjacent Phase 1 and Phase 2 building sites. The Applicant has confirmed that additional site investigations will be undertaken and issued as part of any reserved matters application to, alongside a detailed surface water drainage scheme.

Notwithstanding this, the LLFA accepts the framework scheme proposed and considers that the development is capable of acceptably dealing with surface water run-off such that no undue flood risk would result. A condition shall be imposed to secure a detailed drainage scheme which would need to be submitted alongside any future reserved matters application.

#### Foul water

It is proposed for foul drainage to be disposed of via a dedicated below ground piped network, which would subsequently discharge into the Anglian Water sewerage system. A pre-planning application was made by the Applicant to Anglian Water, who confirmed that there is adequate capacity in the sewerage system and wastewater treatment plant.

Based upon the above, it is considered that drainage from the site would be adequately managed such that no increased flood risk either on- or off-site would result. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), paragraphs 155 and 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and the Peterborough Flood and Water Management SPD (2019).

#### **f) Neighbour amenity**

Turning first to the Phase 2 building, this would stand at three storeys in height and be sited to the rear of the Phase 1 building that is currently being constructed. In terms of its physical presence, it would not result in undue overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking of nearby residential dwellings by virtue of its siting.

However, as the proposal is for a Research and Development use, a considerable amount of plant and mechanical extraction is proposed. In addition, it is proposed for the building to be heated by means of air source heat pumps. A detailed Noise Assessment has accompanied the application and this is accepted by the Council's Pollution Control Officer. They have however requested that, as with Phase 1, a noise limit be imposed upon the development such that no greater than a noise level of 49dB LAeq (1hr) between 07.00hrs and 23.00hrs and 35dB LAeq (15mins) at all other times results at the nearest noise sensitive receptor (residential dwelling).

In addition, as the main proportion of future occupiers are not yet known at this time, the flue systems they would utilise are not known. Therefore it is considered necessary to impose a further

condition that requires each Phase 2 occupant with mechanical plant to be installed at the site be required to submit details of the location, sound power data, operating hours and frequency spectrum, and where necessary attenuation measures to demonstrate individual and cumulative compliance with the overarching set noise level

With regards to the proposed car park, this would be sited on the existing Regional Pool car park site and extend to a maximum height to mirror that of the Phase 1 building. This car park would be sited in closer proximity to residential dwellings to the north/north-east (Stephenson Court) than Phase 1, but would still be some 48 metres from the facing primary habitable windows. It is considered that this degree of separation is sufficient to prevent undue overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing impact to occupiers of those properties. Whilst the car park would be visible whereas at present there are no substantial buildings, in planning terms there is no right to a view and the visual impact has been found acceptable (see (b) above).

Turning to noise from the car park, it is accepted that it would be in use 24 hours a day, 7 days per week and to a more intensive level than the existing car park. However it is not considered that this would give rise to an unacceptable level of disturbance to neighbouring occupants given the degree of separation and that a similar number of car parking spaces were previously in close proximity (given the former Wirrina car park).

Taking the above into account, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupants and it is therefore in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

#### **g) Ecology and trees**

##### Ecology and biodiversity

The application has been accompanied by an Ecological Assessment and a Bat Survey Report, and neither Natural England nor the Council's Wildlife Officer have raised objections to the proposal (either full or outline).

The application site lies in close proximity to, and within the Impact Risk Zone, of the Nene Washes SSSI/SPA/SAC/Ramsar site which is of international importance owing to its qualifying species (over wintering birds). Natural England have confirmed that the proposal would not have an undue impact upon this important site.

Turning to habitat impacts, the site as a whole (not including Bishops Park which is not to be built upon) is predominantly formed by previously developed brownfield land that was formerly/currently in use as surface parking. There are however mature shelterbelts and open space surrounding these areas which are of rich habitat potential.

It has been identified that the site has potential for roosting bats and nesting birds. However, of the trees identified within the application site as having bat roosting potential, there were no roosting bats identified during the emergence surveys, and commuting and foraging activity was limited to three bats during the first session, and a single bat during the second. Accordingly, it is not considered that the proposal would have undue impact upon this protected species.

With regards to badgers, a survey has been undertaken which found no setts, however owing to their mobility, the Ecological Assessment recommends that a pre-commencement further survey be undertaken of the car park site and its surroundings (to a buffer of 50m). Finally, there is high potential for hedgehogs within the site and therefore mitigation measures are proposed within the submitted Assessment.

The Council's Wildlife Officer has raised no objections to the contents or mitigation measures proposed, and has requested a number of conditions relating to ecological protection. With regards to the full and outline elements of the scheme, a pre-commencement condition relating to submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been recommended by the

Wildlife Officer. Whilst this is noted, Officers are of the view that the requirements of such a condition, given that the submitted Ecological Assessment does not highlight significant likelihood of protected species, appear unduly onerous. This is particularly given the conditions imposed upon 20/01044/R4FUL (Phase 1) which shares a site. As such, it is instead considered more appropriate to secure compliance with the mitigation measures contained within the submitted Assessment which is consistent with the approach for Phase 1.

The other conditions proposed by the Wildlife Officer (biodiversity enhancement scheme, lighting design and badger surveys) are considered necessary and appropriate, and shall be secured on both the full and outline elements.

Subject to the imposition of such conditions, it is considered that the proposal would not result in unacceptable impact to species of principal importance, and would secure overall biodiversity gain. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policies LP22 and LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), paragraphs 98 and 99 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and the Peterborough Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity SPD (2019).

### Trees

Following revision to the outline element of the proposal, moving the siting of the car park from Bishops Park to the Regional Pool car park, a revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and Method Statement (AMS) were submitted. The City Council's Tree Officer has raised no objections to the contents of either document.

The site contains and abuts a number of mature trees which form shelterbelts and are intrinsic to the character of the Embankment and city as a whole. Of all the trees within/adjacent to the site, only 1no. Category B tree, an ash, which is located to the east of the proposed Phase 2 building, between that and the Regional Pool car park, is proposed to be felled. Whilst the loss of any trees is harmful and regrettable, in this instance it is accepted as being necessary to facilitate the development. Further, a scheme of mitigating and enhancement planting is proposed by the Applicant which is to be secured by condition. Such additional planting would ensure an overall net gain in trees and biodiversity on the site.

On this basis, the proposal would ensure that trees of key amenity value to the surrounding area are protected, and that overall enhancement to the landscape quality of the area is secured, in accordance with Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

### **h) Contamination**

As part of the assessment of the Phase 1 development (20/01044/R4FUL), a Phase 2 Contamination Assessment Report was prepared. In addition to the Phase 1 site, the survey area included the site for the Phase 2 building and extended southwards to include the woodland and sports pitches.

The assessment confirmed that risk of the encountered ground contamination affecting site users when present beneath buildings and permanent areas of hardstanding would be very low and as such, no formal scheme of remediation was proposed. This has been accepted by the Council's Pollution Control Officer.

However, for the outline element of the proposal (car park), no contamination assessment has been undertaken and therefore, this shall need to be secured by way of a pre-commencement condition.

Subject to the above, the proposal would not pose an unacceptable risk to human health or controlled waters through contamination, in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 178 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

### **i) Air quality**

Owing to the size of the development proposed (in terms of the number of vehicle movements

to/from the site, air quality is a matter which must be considered. The Applicant has therefore submitted an Air Quality Assessment which has been reviewed by the Council's Pollution Control Officer.

They have advised that at present, there is not sufficient information to accept the submitted AQA. This relates to the modelled nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and atmospheric aerosol particles (PM<sub>10</sub>) for the development which the report states to be no more than a 5% increase and therefore negligible. However, the same results were shown for the Phase 1 development and it is not clear from the assessment submitted, whether or not the increase is on top of those for Phase 1 or not. The concern is therefore that the impact of each Phase is being considered in isolation, whilst the impacts should be considered cumulatively.

Notwithstanding this, the Pollution Control Officer is of the view that the overall impact is not likely to be significant, or such that mitigation (whether physical through design, financial or administrative) could not be secured, therefore a condition requiring submission of a revised AQA has been recommended. As the need for the AQA relates mainly to the traffic movements associated with the proposed car park, this shall be secured on the outline permission only and be required alongside any future reserved matters submission to ensure mitigation can be factored in at the detailed design stage.

Subject to securing a condition as set out above, the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the amenities of nearby residents through air quality impact, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 181 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

#### **j) Future occupant amenity**

Whilst the proposal is not for residential use, there is still a need to ensure that future occupiers are not subject to unacceptable noise disturbance. The submitted Noise Assessment identifies that that ventilation of the building is to be achieved via a combination of mechanical ventilation and openable windows. The Council's Pollution Control Officer has advised that the proposed mitigation measures for both glazing and ventilation would achieve the required British Standard for open plan offices/workspaces in terms of noise levels, however it would exceed criteria recommended for research laboratories and other type of cellular office space. As such, a condition has been recommended which secures the submitted noise mitigation in the event that the building is an open plan arrangement, but should this change, revised glazing/ventilation specifications are required. This is considered appropriate and necessary.

#### **k) Other matters**

In response to those objections received and not addressed above:

##### **- Lack of overarching masterplan for the University campus**

The comments of the Civic Society and Council's Conservation Officer with regards to the lack of an overarching masterplan for the University of Peterborough are noted. Indeed, Officers concur with some of the views that the lack of an overall vision for the site brings a number of difficulties in ensuring that any development/permissions at this time do not prejudice the future ability to deliver latter phases. However, there is no policy requirement for such a masterplan and therefore, provided that each and every proposal submitted accords with the relevant policies of the Local Plan (and any other material planning considerations), the lack of a masterplan cannot be used as a reason to refuse the current proposal.

##### **- Loss of public open space**

The proposal no longer seeks any development on Bishops Park or any designated Public Open Space.

##### **- Other development on the Embankment**

The application can only be assessed in relation to development that has either been allocated within the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019), has been granted planning permission or

where a planning application has been submitted. The proposals for the slip road from the Fletton Parkway, and the Peterborough United FC stadium do not meet any of these criteria and therefore cannot be considered in the determination of this application.

- Alternative car park locations

Alternative locations for the proposed development are not a material planning consideration.

- Insufficient public consultation

Public consultation has been undertaken in accordance with, and in exceedance of, the duties set out within the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 (as amended), the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) and the Council's own Statement of Community Involvement. A total of 578 notification letters were sent to local residents, 3no. site notices were erected in vicinity of the site, and a press advert was placed in the Peterborough Telegraph.

Despite the restrictions of the current pandemic, the Government has issued clear guidance that Local Planning Authorities should continue to determine applications. As such, it would not be possible for the LPA to delay the determination of this application.

## **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 represents the next phase of the development of the University of Peterborough and would be sited on land which is in line with the vision for the Riverside North Policy Area. As such, the principle of development is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies LP4 and LP51 of the Local Plan (2019);
- the application scheme would result in enhanced educational offer associated with the newly created University of Peterborough, which should be afforded great weight in decision-making, in accordance with paragraph 94 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019);
- the proposed design is considered to be of high quality that would enhance the site and its wider surroundings, in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- the proposal would ensure that the significance of nearby designated heritage assets are preserved and accordingly, the proposal is in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraphs 193, 194 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019);
- no harm to any buried heritage assets of key importance would result, in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019);
- the proposal would not result in a severe impact to the capacity of the surrounding public highway network, safe access would be afforded to all users, and adequate parking provision would be made to meet the demands arising from the Phase 2 development, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019);
- drainage from the site would be adequately managed such that no increased flood risk either on- or off-site would result, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), paragraphs 155 and 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and the Peterborough Flood and Water Management SPD (2019);
- an unacceptable level of harm would not result to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- the proposal would not result in unacceptable impact to species of principal importance and would secure overall biodiversity gain, in accordance with Policies LP22 and LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), paragraphs 98 and 99 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and the Peterborough Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity SPD (2019);
- the proposal would ensure that trees of key amenity value to the surrounding area are protected, and that overall enhancement to the landscape quality of the area is secured, in

- accordance with Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- the proposal would not pose an unacceptable risk to human health or controlled waters through contamination, in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 178 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019); and
- the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the air quality of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 181 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

## **7 Recommendation**

The case officer recommends that Planning Permission (Regulation 3) is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions and subject to completion of the outstanding public consultation period with no new substantive objections that have not previously been considered above being received.

### **The following conditions relate to the full element of this permission only (Phase 2 building development):**

- 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:

- Proposed Block Plan (drawing number UOP002-MCW-CP-00-DR-A-0105 Revision P04);
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan (drawing number UOP002-MCW-ZZ-00-DR-A-0110 Revision P11);
- Proposed First Floor Plan (drawing number UOP002-MCW-ZZ-01-DR-A-0111 Revision P11);
- Proposed Second Floor Plan (drawing number UOP002-MCW-ZZ-02-DR-A-0112 Revision P12);
- Proposed Roof Plan (drawing number UOP002-MCW-ZZ-RF-DR-A-0113 Revision P10);
- Proposed North Elevation (drawing number UOP002-MCW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0130 Revision P07);
- Proposed East Elevation (drawing number UOP002-MCW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0131 Revision P07);
- Proposed South Elevation (drawing number UOP002-MCW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0132 Revision P07);
- Proposed West Elevation (drawing number UOP002-MCW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0133 Revision P07);
- Proposed Section AA (drawing number UOP002-MCW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0150 Revision P08);
- Proposed Section BB (drawing number UOP002-MCW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-0151 Revision P07);
- Existing Block Plan (drawing number UOP002-MCW-ZZ-00-DR-A-9901 Revision P05); and
- Existing Site Plan (drawing number UOP002-MCW-CP-00-DR-A-9904 Revision P02).

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

- C 3 Prior to their installation, details of all external materials to be used on the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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 LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 4 Notwithstanding the submitted information, no land raising, with the exception of that associated with landscaping, is permitted and the finished floor levels of the development shall be no more than 340mm above existing ground levels.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 5 All vehicles leaving the site during the period of construction shall pass through wheel cleaning equipment and enter the public highway in a clean condition, free of any debris or slurry which could fall onto the public highway. The wheel cleaning equipment shall be retained on site in full working order throughout the duration of construction works.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 6 No later than 6 calendar months following first use of the building hereby permitted, a car park of no less than 128 additional spaces above and beyond the existing Regional Pool car park capacity, subject to the outline element of this permission, shall be constructed and made available for use in accordance with the reserved matters secured under condition C1 of the outline permission.

Reason: To ensure that adequate city centre parking capacity is available to meet the demands generated by the development and prevent undue harm to the safety of the surrounding public highway network, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 7 Prior to first use of the building hereby permitted, the areas shown on drawing number UOP002-MCW-CP-00-DR-A-0105 Revision P04 'Proposed Block Plan', for the purposes of the access, parking and turning of vehicles, shall be laid out, surfaced and made available for use. Thereafter, those areas shall not be used for any purpose other than the access, parking and turning of vehicles in connection with the use of the University and/or development hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with satisfactory access, parking and turning in the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 8 Prior to first use of the development by students, a parking management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include, where applicable:

- Measures for the control and limitation of car park usage;
- Allocation and demarcation of parking bays for each user type (staff, students and visitors);
- Allocation and demarcation of electric vehicle charging points;
- A Charging regime;
- Methods of payment, ticketing and/or permits; and
- Method of securing the site out of hours.



The approved parking management plan shall be implemented in full prior to first use of the development by students. It shall thereafter be maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to control the demand for on-site parking which is limited and in the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 9 Notwithstanding the submitted details and prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a cycle parking scheme for 54 bicycles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be based upon the cycle parking locations shown on drawing number UOP002-MCW-CP-00-DR-A-0105 Revision P04 and include:

- the design of secure cycle shelters; and
- a timetable for the provision of the cycle parking.

The cycle parking shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme, including the timetable contained therein. Thereafter, the cycle parking shall be retained in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of ensuring that the site is served by sufficient cycle parking and to promote more sustainable methods of travel to/from the site, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C10 The initiatives and action plan to reduce travel by private motor vehicle set out within the submitted 'Framework Travel Plan' (reference UOP002-TTC-ZZ-XX-RP-T-0002-S4-P02 Revision P03) shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable contained therein. Thereafter, the Travel Plan shall be monitored and updated in accordance with the details set out in the Framework Travel Plan.

Reason: To reduce travel to/from the site by private motor vehicle, reduce demand upon city centre parking and encourage more sustainable methods of travel, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C11 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until the sustainable drainage scheme for the site has been completed in accordance with the following:

- Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy Report (Smith and Wallwork Engineers, reference UOP002-SAW-ZZ-XX-RP-C-0005 Revision P03, dated 14 April 2021);
- Letter from Smith and Wallwork Engineers dated 18 May 2021 (reference UOP002-SAW-ZZ-ZZ-CO-C-002 Revision P01);
- Proposed Roof Plan (drawing number UOP002-MCW-ZZ-RF-DR-A-0113 Revision P10); and
- Below Ground Foul and Surface Water Layout (Site Wide) (drawing number UOP002-SAW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-C-5201 Revision P04).

Thereafter, the sustainable drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the submitted 'Foul and Surface Water Drainage Operation and Maintenance Document' (Smith and Wallwork Engineers, reference UOP002-SAW-ZZ-XX-RP-C-0006 Revision P02, dated 18 May 2021) in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no flood risk on or off the site resulting from the proposed development, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and the Peterborough Flood and Water Management SPD (2019).

- C12 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the submitted 'Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (Amended March 2021)' (Cantia Arboricultural Services reference CAS/2021/114) including drawing number CAS/2021/114 'Tree Protection Plan (Revised)'.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the area and ensure that trees of key amenity value are preserved, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C13 (a) Notwithstanding the submitted details and prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a scheme for the hard and soft landscaping of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the following:

- i) Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting;
- ii) All boundary treatments which, if impenetrable, must include adequately sized gaps for the movement of hedgehogs at a spacing of 10 metre intervals;
- iii) Surfacing of all access, parking and vehicle turning areas;
- iv) Surfacing of all pedestrian access and circulation areas;
- v) Street furniture; and
- vi) Closed circuit television (CCTV) provision.

The approved hard landscaping scheme (boundary treatments, surfacing, street furniture and CCTV) shall be carried out in full prior to first occupation of the development.

The soft landscaping (planting) shall be carried out no later than the first available planting season following first occupation of the development, or alternatively in accordance with a timetable for landscape implementation which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(b) 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 the visual amenity and security of the surrounding area, mitigation of the tree removal permitted and the enhancement of biodiversity, in accordance with Policies LP16, LP19, LP28 and LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and the Peterborough Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity SPD (2019).

- C14 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a scheme for the external lighting of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall not exceed the obtrusive light limits specified in environmental zone E3 of the Institution of Lighting Professionals document 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light: Guidance Note 01:20'.

In the event of any reasonable light pollution complaint being received by the Local Planning Authority, the Developer or their successors in Title, shall be required to undertake a full lighting assessment to demonstrate compliance with the above limits 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 light assessment and implemented in accordance with the submitted details within 28 days of approval by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure no unacceptable harm results from external lighting upon neighbouring residential properties or protected species and habitat which surround the site, in accordance with Policies LP17, LP22 and LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and the Peterborough Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity SPD (2019).

- C15 No development shall take place unless and until a further detailed badger survey has been undertaken as described within paragraph 4.55 of the submitted 'Ecological Assessment' (Land Use Consultants Ltd, reference UOP002-LUC-ZZ-XX-RP-EC-0001, dated 12 April 2021). In the event that badgers are discovered within the impact area of the development, then no development shall take place unless and until the relevant protected species license has been obtained and evidence of such submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that no harm results to protected species, in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), the Protection of Badgers Act (1992) and the Peterborough Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity SPD (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure that no badgers move into the risk area of the development in the intervening period from when the ecological assessment was undertaken to when development commences.

- C16 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Bat Survey Report (LUC, Version 1, June 2020) and the species/habitat mitigation measures set out within the submitted 'Ecological Assessment' (Land Use Consultants Ltd, reference UOP002-LUC-ZZ-XX-RP-EC-0001, dated 12 April 2021).

Throughout the period of construction works, all construction trenches shall be covered overnight and a method of escape for mammals, specifically hedgehogs, shall be provided to each trench.

Reason: In the interest of preserving the biodiversity value of the site and protected species, in accordance with Policies LP22 and LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and the Peterborough Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity SPD (2019).

- C17 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the submitted Phase 2 Contamination Assessment Report (Ground Engineering, reference C14884A, dated January 2020), in particular the soil gas mitigation which requires the use of a well-constructed concrete floor and gas resistant membrane. The mitigation measures shall thereafter be retained and maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of protecting the amenity of future occupiers, in accordance with Policies LP17 and LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

- C18 Upon completion of mitigation, a copy of a closure report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The report shall provide verification that the required works regarding contamination have been carried out in accordance with the submitted Phase 2 Contamination Assessment Report (Ground Engineering, reference C14884A, dated January 2020) and results of all post-remediation sampling and monitoring.

Reason: To provide verification that the required remediation has been carried out to appropriate standards, in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

- C19 If, during development, contamination not previously considered is identified, then the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately and no further work shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a scheme for dealing with the suspect contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The

development shall thereafter not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure all contamination within the site is dealt with such that no risk to human health or controlled waters results, in accordance Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraphs 178-180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

C20 a) The noise mitigation measures set out within the submitted Noise Assessment (Anderson Acoustics, reference 4938\_001R\_1-0\_MR Phase 2) shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted. The glazing shall be in accordance with requirements detailed in 'Table 4.1' Minimum external glazing requirements (page 14) and the ventilation scheme shall be implemented in accordance with Section 4.2. Thereafter, all noise mitigation shall be retained and maintained as such in perpetuity.

b) In the event that building occupation alters from an open plan office style, prior to first occupation of any internal layout revision, the Developer or their successors in Title, shall submit a revised glazing and ventilation scheme that accords with the specified internal noise levels contained within BS 8233:2014 'Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings' (or any Standard replacing that Standard in part or whole, and with or without modification). Thereafter, the revised glazing and ventilation scheme shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of any internal layout revision.

Reason: To ensure that the future occupiers of the development are not subject to unacceptable noise disturbance, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

C21 The rating level of noise emitted from any external plant/machinery (such as air conditioning units) shall not exceed the cumulative limits of 49dB LAeq (1hr) between 07.00hrs and 23.00hrs and 35dB LAeq (15mins) at all other times. The noise levels shall be determined at the nearest noise sensitive premises, and in accordance with British Standard 4142:2014 'Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound' (or any Standard replacing that Standard in part or whole, and with or without modification).

A relaxation of +10 dB LAeq above these criteria is allowed for the operation of the emergency generator for a period of no more than 48 hours.

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 LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

C22 Prior to the installation and use of any mechanical plant, the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- operating hours;
- location within the site or on the building;
- sound power level(s);
- frequency spectrum;

- impact upon the cumulative noise level at the nearest noise sensitive receptor (residential property); and
- where necessary, attenuation/mitigation measures.

The noise levels shall be determined in accordance with British Standard 4142:2014 'Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound' (or any Standard replacing that Standard in part or whole, and with or without modification).

The mechanical plant shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained and retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of preserving the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

- C23 The development hereby permitted shall be used as a research and development facility and/or a higher education University and associated ancillary functions only within Classes E(g) of Part A and F.1(a) of Part B of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or any provision equivalent to that class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) only, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any statutory instrument or Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: The development has only been considered acceptable in light of the specific uses proposed and further assessment would be required should the use alter.

**The following conditions relate to the outline element of this permission only (car park development)**

- C 1 Approval of details of the appearance, landscaping and layout of the development (hereinafter called 'the reserved matters') shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.

Reason: To ensure that the development meets the policy standards required by the development plan and any other material considerations including national and local policy guidance, and in accordance with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C 2 The plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to in condition C1 above, relating to the appearance, landscaping and layout, shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority and shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development meets the policy standards required by the development plan and any other material considerations including national and local policy guidance, and in accordance with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C 3 Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C 4 The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C 5 The plans and particulars to be submitted under the provisions of condition C1 above shall accord with the parameters shown on the following drawings:

- Parameters Plan Access and Movement (drawing number MCW-ZZ-XX-DI-A-0011 Revision P02);
- Parameters Plan View and Aspect (drawing number MCW-ZZ--XX-DI-A-0012 Revision P02); and
- Parameters Plan Height (drawing number MCW-ZZ-00-DI-A-0013 Revision P02).

Reason: To restrict the development to that which was applied for and for which the impacts have been assessed, and to ensure that the development meets the policy standards required by the development plan and any other material considerations including national and local policy guidance.

- C 6 Prior to their installation, details of all external materials to be used in the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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 LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 7 No development shall take place unless and until a programme of archaeological work, including a Written Scheme of Investigation, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No 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 Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure that no groundworks take place which may result in harm to potential buried heritage assets.

- C 8 No development shall take place unless and until details of all existing and proposed finished building slab and site levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure that no groundworks take place which result in finished levels which result in unacceptable harm to the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

- C 9 All vehicles leaving the site during the period of construction shall pass through wheel cleaning equipment and enter the public highway in a clean condition, free of any debris or

slurry which could fall onto the public highway. The wheel cleaning equipment shall be retained on site in full working order throughout the duration of construction works.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C10 Prior to first use of the development hereby permitted, the revised vehicular access onto Bishops Road shown on drawing number UOP0002-TTC-ZZ-00-DR-T-0101-S4-P04 'Proposed Access Arrangements Sheet 1 of 4' contained within Appendix D of the submitted Transport Assessment (reference UOP0002-TTC-ZZ-XX-RP-T-0001-S4-P03) shall be constructed and made available for use.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C11 Prior to first use of the revised vehicular access hereby permitted, a scheme of off-site highway works relating to construction of that access shall be submitted to and in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved off-site highway works shall be implemented in full prior to first use of the vehicular access.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C12 Prior to first use of the revised vehicular access hereby permitted, the vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays shown on drawing number UOP0002-TTC-ZZ-00-DR-T-0101-S4-P04 'Proposed Access Arrangements Sheet 2 of 4' contained within Appendix D of the submitted Transport Assessment (reference UOP0002-TTC-ZZ-XX-RP-T-0001-S4-P03) shall be provided. Thereafter, those splays shall be kept clear of any obstruction above a height of 60mm from ground level in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C13 Prior to first use of the revised vehicular access hereby permitted, a scheme for the permanent closure of the existing access serving the Reginal Pool car park shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out no later than 3 months of the revised access being brought in to use, or in accordance with a timetable first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Suitable temporary barriers shall be placed as an interim measure, as required.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C14 No development shall take place unless and until a detailed sustainable surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall broadly accord with the principles set out in the submitted 'Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy Report' (Smith and Wallwork Engineers, reference UOP002-SAW-ZZ-XX-RP-C-0005 Revision P03, dated 14 April 2021) and include, but not limited to:

- The proposed connection point and discharge rate into the surface water sewer;
- Written confirmation that Anglian Water accepts the proposed connection and discharge rate;
- Results of the infiltration testing and details of the groundwater level for the car park site. If infiltration is shown not to be viable, then the surface water drainage strategy referred to above shall be amended to reflect this;

- A surface water drainage strategy plan;
- Hydraulic calculations;
- Overland flood flow and exceedance routes;
- Construction details of all drainage assets; and
- Maintenance and management schedules for all drainage assets, which includes details of the parties responsible for said maintenance.

The sustainable drainage scheme shall be constructed in full prior to first use of the development and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved maintenance and management schedules in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no flood risk on or off the site resulting from the proposed development, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and the Peterborough Flood and Water Management SPD (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition as no groundworks can take place unless the details of below ground drainage have been determined.

- C15 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the submitted 'Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (Amended March 2021)' (Cantia Arboricultural Services reference CAS/2021/114) including drawing number CAS/2021/114 'Tree Protection Plan (Revised)'.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the area and ensure that trees of key amenity value are preserved, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C16 a) The plans and particulars to be submitted under the provisions of condition C1 above shall include a scheme for the hard and soft landscaping of the site. The scheme shall include details of the following:

- i) Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting;
- ii) All boundary treatments which, if impenetrable, must include adequately sized gaps for the movement of hedgehogs at a spacing of 10 metre intervals;
- iii) Surfacing of all access, parking and vehicle turning areas;
- iv) Surfacing of all pedestrian access and circulation areas;
- v) Street furniture; and
- vi) Closed circuit television (CCTV) provision.

The approved hard landscaping scheme (boundary treatments, surfacing, street furniture and CCTV) shall be carried out in full prior to first use of the development.

The soft landscaping (planting) shall be carried out no later than the first available planting season following completion of the development, or alternatively in accordance with a timetable for landscape implementation which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(b) 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 the visual amenity and security of the surrounding area, mitigation of the tree removal permitted and the enhancement of biodiversity, in accordance



with Policies LP16, LP19, LP28 and LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and the Peterborough Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity SPD (2019).

- C17 Prior to first use of the development hereby permitted, a scheme for the external lighting of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall not exceed the obtrusive light limits specified in environmental zone E3 of the Institution of Lighting Professionals document 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light: Guidance Note 01:20'.

In the event of any reasonable light pollution complaint being received by the Local Planning Authority, the Developer or their successors in Title, shall be required to undertake a full lighting assessment to demonstrate compliance with the above limits 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 light assessment and implemented in accordance with the submitted details within 28 days of approval by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure no unacceptable harm results from external lighting upon neighbouring residential properties or protected species and habitat which surround the site, in accordance with Policies LP17, LP22 and LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and the Peterborough Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity SPD (2019).

- C18 No development shall take place unless and until a further detailed badger survey has been undertaken as described within paragraph 4.55 of the submitted 'Ecological Assessment' (Land Use Consultants Ltd, reference UOP002-LUC-ZZ-XX-RP-EC-0001, dated 12 April 2021). In the event that badgers are discovered within the impact area of the development, then no development shall take place unless and until the relevant protected species license has been obtained and evidence of such submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that no harm results to protected species, in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), the Protection of Badgers Act (1992) and the Peterborough Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity SPD (2019).

- C19 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Bat Survey Report (LUC, Version 1, June 2020) and the species/habitat mitigation measures set out within the submitted 'Ecological Assessment' (Land Use Consultants Ltd, reference UOP002-LUC-ZZ-XX-RP-EC-0001, dated 12 April 2021).

Throughout the period of construction works, all construction trenches shall be covered overnight and a method of escape for mammals, specifically hedgehogs, shall be provided to each trench.

Reason: In the interest of preserving the biodiversity value of the site and protected species, in accordance with Policies LP22 and LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and the Peterborough Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity SPD (2019).

- C20 No development shall take place unless and until details of a comprehensive contaminated land investigation have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and until the scope of works approved therein have been implemented where possible. The assessment shall include all of the following measures unless the Local Planning Authority dispenses with any such requirements in writing:

a) A Phase I desk study carried out by a competent person to identify and evaluate all potential sources of contamination and the impacts on land and/or controlled waters, relevant to the site. The desk study shall establish a 'conceptual model' of the site and

identify all plausible pollutant linkages. Furthermore, the assessment shall set objectives for intrusive site investigation works/Quantitative Risk Assessment (or state if none required). Two full copies of the desk study and a non-technical summary shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority without delay upon completion.

b) A site investigation shall be carried out to fully and effectively characterise the nature and extent of any land contamination and/or pollution of controlled waters. It shall specifically include a risk assessment that adopts the Source-Pathway-Receptor principle and takes into account the site's existing status and proposed new use. Two full copies of the site investigation and findings shall be forwarded to the Local Planning Authority.

No development shall be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure potential risks arising from previous site uses have been fully assessed in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 178 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition because contamination must be adequately identified and remediated prior to construction works taking place to prevent risks of pollution during the ground works and construction process.

- C21 Where the risk assessment identifies any unacceptable risk or risks, an appraisal of remedial options and proposal of the preferred option to deal with land contamination and/or pollution of controlled waters affecting the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. No works, other than investigative works, shall be carried out on the site prior to receipt and written approval of the preferred remedial option by the Local Planning Authority.

No development shall be carried out except in accordance with the approved remedial details unless an alternative scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the proposed remediation plan is appropriate and in order to protect human health and controlled waters, in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 178 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition because contamination must be adequately remediated prior to construction works taking place to prevent risks of pollution during the ground works and construction process.

- C22 Upon completion of remediation, a copy of a closure report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The report shall provide verification that the required works regarding contamination have been carried out in accordance with the approved Method Statement(s). Post remediation sampling and monitoring results shall be included in the closure report.

Reason: To provide verification that the required remediation has been carried out to appropriate standards, in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 178 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

- C23 If, during development, contamination not previously considered is identified, then the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately and no further work shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a scheme for dealing with the suspect contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure all contamination within the site is dealt with such that no risk to human health or controlled waters results, in accordance Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraphs 178-180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

C24 The plans and particulars to be submitted under the provisions of condition C1 above shall include a revised air quality assessment. The assessment shall:

- report on the air quality impacts of each individual phase of the University and the cumulative impacts of all of the phases in the development which have been granted planning permission; and
- where necessary, set out appropriate mitigation measures (whether physical or administrative).

The assessment shall be completed in accordance with Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) and the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) Land-use Planning and Development Control: Planning for Air Quality.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved air quality assessment and any mitigation measures contained therein shall be implemented in full prior to first use of the development.

Reason: To ensure that no unacceptable impact to the amenities of neighbouring residential occupants occurs by way of harmful air quality impacts, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 181 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Copies to Councillor Mahboob Hussain, Councillor Amjad Iqbal and Councillor Mohammed Jamil

This page is intentionally left blank