

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee **10 October 2018**

AUTHOR/S: Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development

Application Number:	S/1694/18/FL
Parish:	Wimpole
Proposal:	Construction of Multi-use Trail
Site Address:	Wimpole Hall, Wimpole Park, Wimpole Park Road, Wimpole, Royston, Cambridgeshire, SG8 0BW
Applicant:	The National Trust
Recommendation:	Delegated Approval subject to the completion of a unilateral undertaking
Key Material Considerations:	Principle of development Impact on setting of the Listed Building, Park and Gardens Character and Appearance of the Area Ecology and Wildlife Highways and transport
Committee Site Visit:	09 October 2018
Departure Application:	No
Presenting Officer:	Alison Twyford, Senior Planning Officer
Application Brought to Committee Because:	Referred from Chairs Delegation following a recommendation from Officers that the application has a wide public interest.
Date by Which Decision Due:	03 August 2018

Executive Summary

1. The application relates to land on the Wimpole Estate which is one of the District's most popular visitor attractions being home to the Grade 1 Listed Wimpole Hall, a neo classical country mansion set within the larger Grade 1 Registered Park and Garden. There are a number of other heritage assets and listed buildings within the grounds and immediate vicinity of the estate, including two Scheduled Monuments. Its landscape works can be attributed to landscape designers including Henry Wise, Charles Bridgeman, 'Capability' Brown and Humphry Repton. In terms of formal designations, the Eversden

and Wimpole Woods to the north of the Estate are designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) as the trees are known to support a colony of Barbastelle Bats. There are also a number of mature and veteran trees within the grounds of the estate that are of high conservation importance.

2. The application proposes to create a multi-use trail along existing tracks and footpaths through the parkland and surrounding woodland with new build sections primarily on arable farmland. The proposals would create an 8.54 km loop of multi-use trail (MUT). The MUT follows 1.64 km of existing private tarmac roads, 0.90 km of existing farm tracks, and 0.66 km of existing woodland tracks, where track surface improvements are proposed. The new build sections of the MUT are proposed in arable farmland (3.99 km), grassland (1.21 km) and woodland (0.2 km). The new build sections of the MUT will be 2.5m–3m wide. It is anticipated that a range of users, including cyclists, runners, walkers, those in adapted wheelchairs and families with pushchairs and scooters will benefit from these enhancement works.
3. Despite concerns from a number of local interest groups, both Historic England and the Council's heritage officer raise no objections to the impact on the setting of the listed building, park and gardens. Similarly both Natural England and the Council's Ecology Officer are satisfied that the impact on wildlife can be mitigated by way of appropriate conditions.
4. Officers are satisfied that the potential conflict between pedestrians and cyclists will not be to such an extent that warrants refusal either on highway safety or public enjoyment of the Hall and Parkland. Arrington parish council has specifically raised concerns regarding visitor parking in the village and the likelihood this may increase. The National Trust has recognised this issue and as a result has offered to fund a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) consultation exercise to see whether local residents in Arrington would want parking restrictions in the form of yellow lining. The TRO process would be delivered by way of a unilateral undertaking (UU) as part of any planning permission.
5. Officers therefore conclude that the proposal should be approved subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions and the proposed UU.

Relevant Planning History

6. S/1338/17/FL - Construction of Multi-use Trail in Sections of the Parkland, Farmland and Woodlands of the Wimpole Estate. – Withdrawn
7. S/2214/17/FL - Change of use of agricultural land to car parking to enable the relocation of existing parking on Phase 1 (700 spaces), and provision of new parking in Phase 2 (660 spaces), making good the land to parkland together with the erection of 2no. buildings at the visitor entrance, provision of a connecting pathway between the new car park and the Wimpole Hall, creation of a new vehicle access together with associated landscaping and drainage works. - Approved

Site Details

8. Wimpole Estate comprises a historic estate, hall and working farm. The estate extends to 1023 hectares and includes extensive areas of parkland, woodland

and farmland. The majority of the Wimpole Estate is farmed, with about 58% of the area in arable or short-term rotational grassland and about 17% in permanent grassland. The estate includes a Grade I Registered Park and Garden and its landscape works can be attributed to landscape designers including Henry Wise, Charles Bridgeman, 'Capability' Brown and Humphry Repton. At the centre of the estate is the Grade 1 Listed Wimpole Hall, a neo classical country mansion set within the larger Grade 1 Registered Park and Garden. There are a number of other heritage assets and listed buildings within the grounds and immediate vicinity of the estate, including two Scheduled Monuments. The application site falls outside of the village framework, contains a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The site also falls within flood zones 2 and 3 and contains potentially contaminated land.

Proposal

9. The proposal seeks to construct a multi-use trail which will formalise an existing track in part and extend it into new sections to allow much more of this historic estate is visited and viewed from different vantage points and will allow the property to upgrade a number of path routes. The MUT provides for a broadly circular route using a mix of existing and new tracks. Specifically, the works are to include an improved surface treatment of existing paths and tracks and new tracks to encourage footfall away from the SSI/SAC woodland and allowing inclusive year round usage in all weather conditions. It is proposed that it will also improve access arrangements with new gates to provide safe access for all pedestrians, wheelchair users and cyclists. New signage is proposed to provide improved wayfinding and encourage use of the wider parkland and estate landscape.
10. During the course of the application an amendment was accepted to the scheme to allow for conflicting information to be addressed, and to respond to some of the concerns raised within the application.

Relevant Policy

11. National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework July 2018 (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

12. Local Plan 2018

Policy S/1 (Vision)
Policy S/2 (Objective of Local Plan)
Policy S/3 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
Policy NH/2 (Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character)
Policy NH/4 (Biodiversity)
Policy NH/5 (Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance)
Policy NH/14 (Heritage Assets)
Policy E/19 (Tourist Facilities and Visitors Attractions)

Consultations

13. Wimpole Parish Council – Support

- The Parish Council want there to be ‘pinch points’ at gates etc. to restrict the speed of bicycles on the trail and reduce the chance of collision.
- The Parish Council would support where possible a Ranger scheme to monitor usage of the trail

14. Arrington Parish Council - Object

Village Parking by visitors –this was already an issue which would be increased by this proposal. With the potential increase to visitor traffic, and as the Wimpole estate car park was chargeable, this would affect residents in Church Lane, Clifden Close and also encourage parking in front of the Arrington gates

Safety of Walkers/conflict with cyclists –Already a serious issue for walkers using the path from Arrington to the hall.

It is noted that the revised plans state that visitors parking in the proposed new car park, would follow the new proposed route in reverse from the original plans. However this route would bring cyclist down the hill directly into conflict with residents and visitors entering or leaving the estate via the Arrington gates onto the pathway.

There can be no effective way of policing the route to ensure cyclists obey the prescribed route so again, cyclists would still use the pathway from the Hall to the Arrington Gate creating the same danger and conflict.

Cyclists do not currently give way to pedestrians and residents are aware of a pedestrian being knocked down by a cyclist. The application refers to the ‘User Experience’ and suggests that the trail is not predominately a cycle route and yet one report in the application highlights it as a cycle route. There are also no plans to police the route to ensure people are using it safely or travelling in the proposed route direction.

Effect on Listed Building –Concern over the effect on the grade 1 listed parkland. The fencing around the estate had been removed over the past couple of years to reflect the original state of the Grade 1 listed parkland. The trail would be conflicting with this.

15. Historic England- Historic England supports the aspiration to create a circuit trail through the park which will be open to all and encourage visitors to experience more of the park and wider landscape. We agree with the conclusions of the Heritage Impact Assessment, which states that the proposed multi-use trail will result in slight adverse impacts to parts of the Registered Park and Garden and Listed Buildings, and consider that this is likely to constitute less than substantial harm. Therefore, we stand by our previous advice that the route of the path is not considered to have a material impact on the visual character of the park or the setting of designated heritage assets.

16. Scientific Officer - This trail does not pass through any known areas of potentially contaminated land, and the proposal is not particularly onerous regarding potential receptors. As such we have no concerns or comments from a contaminated land point of view.

17. **Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Ramblers**- The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire branch of the Ramblers has no objection in principle to a multi-user track, provided that it is an additional facility to the existing routes, rather than replacing them. However, we are very concerned that the track as proposed is, for much of its distance, constructed on the line of the exiting footpath on the estate. This change in surface and increase in wheeled traffic will be a serious loss of amenity. The current footpath is very attractive, with both open views and woodland stretches. In other places where the footpath is retained in its current, the partially fenced-off and surfaced multi-user track (most likely principally for cyclists in such hilly terrain) within a few yards may affect or even destroy this tranquil ambience. It will completely change the character of the original footpath, especially in the open stretches, where it may be partly fenced in away from the remainder of the estate with infrequent places to cross the new track.
18. We are also very concerned that serious problems may arise owing to the potential conflict between inexperienced cyclists who can't really control their bikes on some steep sections above Cobbs Wood Farm, or between very fast cyclists and pedestrians, including families with young children, people with mobility problems, and those with sensory impairment such as deafness. Would there be speed calming measures on the track? We have members who avoid such mixed-use tracks on city pavements and across country, preferring to walk on the grass, for just these reasons. Where the track is fenced off from the surrounding land as suggested, escape from such situations will be difficult.
19. **Local Lead Flood Authority**- We have no objection in principle to the proposed development.
1. Generic Construction Details, PRM Rural Engineering Services Ltd, CP10.5a, 28 March 2018
 2. Planning Design and Access Statement, McLoughlin Planning 0434 30 April 2018
- The above documents demonstrate that surface water can be dealt with on site by draining any water to the edges of the trail. Due to the nature of the development there will be very little impact on the risk of flooding due to minimal impacts on surface water flows.
20. **Environmental Health Officer** – I have had an opportunity to observe the above application and have considered the implications of the proposals. I wish to confirm that I have no adverse comments to make from an environmental health standpoint.
21. **The Environment Agency** - No objection in principle but recommends informatives and conditions.
22. **Landscape Officer** – No objection subject to soft landscape details of new woodland and wildflower grassland creation to compensate for the loss of both trees and grassland as recommended in Ecological Impact Assessment.
- Drawings and documents considered with this application: Ecological Impact Assessment, Signage gates and fences layout CTP.10.3d Rev D, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Survey CTP.10.2c Rev C, Generic construction details CTP10.5a Rev A, muti-use trial & designations CTP.10.1e Rev E, Development site boundary CTP.10.9.

Please note that the drawing *Development site boundary CTP.10.9* which indicates the red line site boundary does not include the new 2no. woodland creation areas. This is to be amended by the applicant and resubmitted.

23. **Natural England** – No objection subject to mitigation being secured. Natural England is satisfied that information provided in the revised Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA) Part 2 is sufficient to demonstrate that the proposed development will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of Eversden and Wimpole Woods Special Area of Conservation (SAC). This is subject to mitigation and monitoring proposals detailed in the EIA 2 being secured through appropriately worded conditions.
24. **Ecology Officer** - Minor amendments to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Ecological Impact Assessments; Part 1 & 2 have been submitted, in addition to a Bat Survey Report (Trees) (Ecoconsult, August 2018).

The Bat Survey Report has identified a pipistrelle spp. roost in T247. This tree has been reassessed and removed from the arborial management strategy, which will maintain the roost in its present form. Therefore no European Protected Species Licences will be required for works to proceed in this area. The report also provided evidence of several other trees which have high, medium, and low bat roosting suitability but which presently contain no bat roosts. These trees are to be removed or manged in one form or another; therefore the report has provided a mitigation strategy for these trees which should be conditioned as part of any decision notice should the case officer be minded to approve the application.

Additional mitigation regarding other protected species (great crested newts, badgers, and reptiles for example) and habitat protection is located in the Ecological Impact Assessments; Part 1 & 2. These strategies appear to be sound and again I would recommend conditioning them within any decision notice issued.

The recommended mitigation strategy is currently distributed between three documents. This strategy should be secured either through a compliance condition, or complied into a single document and discharged through conditioning a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP). The following are two examples of such conditions.

All ecological measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in Ecological Impact Assessment Part 1 (National Trust, August 2018), Ecological Impact Assessment Part 2 (National Trust, August 2018), and Bat Survey Report (Trees) (Ecoconsult, August 2018) as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination.

Or

No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEcMP shall include the following:

- A) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
- B) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".

- C) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
- D) The location and timings of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- E) The times during which construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- F) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- G) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- H) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs if applicable.

The approved CEcMP shall be ahead to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

My preference would be to secure a CEcMP to remove any ambiguity or unnecessary information contained within the three reports; however I will leave this to the discretion of the case officer.

The Ecological Impact Assessment Part 1 provides evidence that badger setts are located in close proximity to two sections of the Multiuse Trail. The use of 'no-dig' and 'hand tools only' strategies in areas within 30 m of these setts should remove the risk of disturbance with no requirement for a licence issued by Natural England. However badgers are a highly mobile species and can establish new sett entrances and new annex and outlier setts very quickly. Therefore the Ecological Impact Assessment has recommended an updated badger survey is undertaken prior to work commencing to inform works.

I am in agreement with this recommendation and would suggest the following condition is included in any decision notice should the case officer be minded to grant permission.

"Prior to the commencement of the development, a badger survey shall be carried out within the site by a suitably qualified ecologist. A report of the findings including a suitable mitigation strategy if required, should badger be found, shall be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details".

I must remind the applicant that should the badger survey provide evidence that a badger licence will be required from Natural England, closure of setts can only be completed between the months of July and October.

The Ecological Impact Assessment Part 2 has recommended habitat creation and enhancement. These strategies appear to be at an advanced stage and I am satisfied that they can be conditioned through compliance rather than through discharge; however this must be with the agreement of the Landscape Officer and other relevant consultees.

I understand that Natural England had voiced concerns regarding post construction bat monitoring. I will not comment on amendments in this respect, as Natural England will be providing their own response to this application.

Finally I would remind the applicant and SCDC of the recent Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) ruling in the matter of People Over Wind and Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta, which has potentially altered the current UK position in relation to Appropriate Assessments under the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC to which all SACs are subject. The ruling infers that if the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) identifies a significant impact to the cited attributes of a European protected site, then an Appropriate Assessment must be conducted. Therefore impacts to European protected sites cannot be scoped out at the HRA stage through the assumption of a suitable mitigation strategy being put in place, and must be taken forward to the Appropriate Assessment stage.

Subject to the agreement of Natural England I can remove my objections to this application.

25. **Cambridgeshire Bat Group** - It is acknowledged that after their withdrawal of the previous planning application, the National Trust has re-routed the MUT to avoid the SAC/SSSI woodland to avoid adverse impacts on the woodland itself and also a qualifying feature for its designation; barbastelle bats. However, 67m of new track will still pass through the SAC/SSSI.

There is still some concern by the Cambridgeshire Bat Group that inadequate survey work has been carried out in areas where the MUT will still affect woodland, in order to properly assess the impacts of construction and the post-construction use of the MUT on bat species using the woodland. Since the previous application, no further survey work for bats has been carried out, including inspections of the trees within Sections 2, 3, and 4 that have been identified as having moderate to very high potential to support roosting bats, in particular barbastelles.

It is also noted that as the MUT has been re-routed, there is now no bat survey data for the new route, as the original bat survey report focuses on the previous route through the woodlands. Existing survey data is now over 18 months old.

Our concerns on the original survey methodology still stand -

- 1) The surveys were undertaken outside of the optimum survey period (May-August inclusive), and although some surveys can be carried out in September, all three bat surveys were carried out between a limited timeframe of 20th-30th September. As such, there is no information on breeding status or bats present at different times of the year.
- 2) Insufficient survey effort. Only dusk surveys (survey type not exactly specified) and trapping surveys were carried out, and these inconsistently. Four 'sites' were targeted for surveys, most of which were not subject to three surveys each. No transect surveys were carried out and static detectors were deployed in only 5 locations. This means that incomplete information is provided as to what bats use the total area of the proposed trail, and how they use the area.
- 3) There is no recent data search from the records centre, only information provided by the National Trust for the Wimpole Estate. What other bats and potential roosts exist within close proximity to the SSSI, SAC, and woodlands?
- 4) It appears from the methodology that minimal effort was applied to carry out the surveys, basing surveys on the minimum recommended under current best practice guidelines (Collins, 2016), and also inconsistent. Paragraph 7.3

states that surveys were carried out from 16.30 to 20.15. Is this a mistake? Because sunset for this time of year is around 19.30, which would mean surveys only continued for 45 minutes after sunset.

4) Static detector surveys also only used for the bare minimum time of 1.5 hours after dusk. What about gathering information on how different bat species use the proposed trail area throughout the night, and towards dawn?

5) The second and third surveys were carried out within 2 days of each other, therefore the third survey provides no useful information on the status of bat populations at different time periods and is not representative.

6) The PRF survey, to look at potential roost features in trees, was carried out an unsuitable time of year due to vegetation on the trees. Although 46 trees were identified as having high or moderate potential to support roosting bats, within a zone of impact from the proposed trail, there is no recommendation for further survey.

7) The most important things missing from the Bat Survey report and the Ecological Impact Assessment-

- There is no detailed discussion or evaluation of all ecological impacts on bats and barbastelle in particular as a result of the proposed trail, regardless of the location of new sections of the route. Discussion focuses on tree works if trees become a hazard to the general public; educating arborists will not adequately address the issue of bats and roosts, as they are not ecologists and so do not have the background knowledge.

- There are no recommendations for further survey, which considering the proposed trail will impact on priority Habitat woodland and has been re-routed, should be required to gain a better understanding of what species utilise the whole site. In additional, trees that may require further management work have had no further survey carried out.

- There is no detailed method of works for how to mitigate for bats during construction of the proposed trail, and no details on the locations of the bat boxes to be erected in place of trees lost.

- There is no detailed monitoring programme.

- The issue of the requirement for a European Protected Species mitigation licence is not addressed as there is simply no discussion about this - trees to be removed should be subject to further survey, ideally climb and inspect surveys by qualified ecologists, as there is potential for roosts to exist within the felling areas.

Other concerns about the Ecological Impact Assessment –

The EclA addresses habitat loss as a result of various sections of the route but does not discuss or evaluate in detail other ecological impacts on species and habitats as a result of construction and post-use, such as disturbance from people and dogs, and degradation of existing habitats due to higher footfall and exploration of the woodland.

No detailed monitoring programme or methodology for bats post-construction has been provided, simply a statement that it will be done.

The EclA does not contain detailed survey methodology and results for other species-specific survey work that was carried out, despite discussing impacts on badger, reptiles, and breeding birds.

The EclA dismisses the likelihood of impacting on important invertebrate assemblages by assuming absence; there is no survey work to support this assumption.

It also concerns us that the EclA has been written by a member of staff of the National Trust, in support of a National Trust application.

26. **The Wildlife Trust-** As noted in our response to a previous version of this proposal, the proposed multi-use trail would have impacts on two designated nature conservation sites: Wimpole Park County Wildlife Site (CWS) and Eversden and Wimpole Woods Special Area of Conservation/Site of Special Scientific Interest (SAC/SSSI).

The CWS was selected for its invertebrate interest, which is associated particularly with the veteran parkland trees. The revised proposal should not have any significant negative impacts on veteran trees or the CWS parkland habitat.

We welcome the proposed creation of new woodland and grassland habitat to compensate for the loss of existing habitat areas.

The SAC is a site of international importance, which was designated because it supports a colony of barbastelle bats. We previously raised concerns about impact on bats, particularly around the area of the trail which was proposed to go through the SAC, and around the increased usage and associated increased tree management requirements. We note that the revised scheme has re-routed the trail so it does not go through the SAC apart from in one small section, and includes fencing and barriers to deter people from entering the woods, and is aiming to avoid any increased requirements for tree management. This is a significant improvement on the previous scheme. However, it is difficult to say with certainty that there will not be impacts, and it will be important, should permission be granted, to have a robust monitoring scheme in place to ensure any effects on bats and their habitats are identified and appropriately dealt with. We ask that Natural England are consulted to ensure they are satisfied with the approach to avoiding, mitigating, and compensating for potential impacts on Eversden and Wimpole Woods and with the proposed post-construction monitoring scheme before any decision is made on this application.

27. **Historic Building Officer** - I have no built heritage objection to the proposal.

The application is accompanied by a proportionately detailed Heritage Statement, meeting the requirement of NPPF 128, and identifying predominantly neutral impact. Slight adverse impact is identified in two instances: distant views to the trail from the Gothic Tower, and distant visitor movement in views from Wimpole Hall. Neither instance is considered to form a reason for refusal.

Please note that Landscape and Archaeology comments are provided separately by respective specialists.

28. **Trees Officer-** The Tree Survey (ref CTP.10.2d), Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Tree Protection Plan (dated 15th August 2018) and Arboricultural Method Statement (dated 15th August 2018) appear to relate to the Bat Survey Report (Trees) (version 16.08.18).

The tree related documents are sufficient for this site and proposal. I have no further comments or observations.

29. The Garden Trust - In addition to The Gardens Trust's original comments, posted June 13th 2018, we repeat that we would welcome a shorter, compromise circuit trail (approximately 5 kms) on the east from the Old Wimpole Road past the Home Farm and back down beside Oddy Doddy Lane which would have less serious impact on the heart of the most significant central core of the historic landscape. Adam White's letter of 20th August, acting as agent to the National Trust, refers to matters discussed at a meeting on the 26th June 2018. It was agreed then that the Council would accept revised plans and supporting information in connection with the newly submitted revised plans and supporting information. It has been deemed necessary to respond to Adam White's letter regard to various statements addressing The Gardens Trust comments and concerns.

1. "With regards to the comments regarding the alleged impact on Wimpole Hall, the Gothic Tower and Brown's original design, North Park, identified as character area 4 in the HIA, is Wimpole Estate (S/1694/18/FL). The overall design and structure of views from key points would remain the same, so that it would remain entirely legible. The effect of the route on the landscape of North Park is discussed in sections 5.13 and 5.15 of the HIA and summarized in a table in 6.3.1."

Although Capability Brown's original design for the North Park is accepted, the letter goes on to refute the GT's judgement that visitors would no longer be able "to 'read', appreciate or understand his work and control of the views." Given that appreciating the overall design aesthetic and structure of the views are obviously key to understanding the Brown landscape, we would like to emphasise that there is considerably more than these two elements to the cultural and educational experience and science of 'reading' landscape. Even if design aesthetic and views remain the same, the use of the designed landscape as a modern, public amenity multi-use cycle trail (MUT) through a countryside park will impinge significantly on the historic character and largely C18 sense of place, which is obviously not the original intended purpose of the design.

Should a MUT be introduced to the north park, rather than feeling free to explore the entire park design at random, pedestrian visitors will likely tend to avoid the immediate vicinity along the length of the trail. Seeing clusters of cycles, some moving at speed, will distract and unnecessarily clutter visitors' views. This would not only detract from the seemingly unchanged C18 century ambience, but also take away from a pro-active 'following in the footsteps of earlier generations' experience, especially C18 historic exploration/negotiation of the park on foot, by carriage or on horseback and the consequential, peaceful appreciation and study of flora and fauna. It will also prevent full understanding of the scale, economics, historic influence and social significance and impact of the design namely:

a) ongoing historic management of the resulting improved use of land for economic growth in farming and forestry b) owners' and sons' better understanding of future 'capabilities' of their land, ie the value and beauty of Nature, while also changing their sporting habits c) considerably changing lives and habits of the ladies of the household giving them healthy and relaxed freedom of exploring a 'safe' park environment.

2. "The avenue beyond the courtyard was originally planted by Charles Bridgeman in the 1720s. This landscape would be unaffected by the

development."

We disagree. The experience of the powerful Wimpole setting and its historic principal approach: namely Bridgeman's 2-mile avenue, (as restored in C20) would be diminished by cycle traffic as previously stated, adding to a 'theme-park' feel, and repeatedly interrupting the line of vision across one of the best historic landscape views of the country. Indeed, its significance is increased in the realisation that, despite its formal design, the Bridgeman avenue was mostly left by Brown, as almost certainly still in good condition and lending visual quality and strength to the flat terrain.

3. "The extent of Brown's work in South Park is unclear." Brown is a proven holistic designer who took the condition of the whole setting into consideration including major views, approaches and the use and management of the land.

Where Brown did impact the south front landscape significantly can be seen in the (now shorter) "link" area between turning circle and avenue, (just as in his approach to Castle Ashby) in his framing of the foreground view of the house with random singleton trees and small groves in a loose oval, shown in Humphry Repton's 1802 plan. A few Brownian trees still survive (including limes left and three beech right, very likely also including holm oaks and shrubbery screening the churchyard.)

4. "The main drive shown on Figure 5.1 of the HIA has been a public right of way since the 1850s. This is of historical interest since most aristocratic landowners would have had the public route closed, and the Earls of Hardwicke certainly had the power and influence to do this but chose not to."

This is not relevant to the case as this 'public route' is today only open for pedestrians and is not now open for vehicular access daily to arrive or depart. Suggesting the road should be used by visitors on the MUT in addition to a setting already disturbed by increasing numbers of pedestrians would impinge on and hamper the experience of historic Wimpole Hall. We repeat that we would welcome a shorter, compromise circuit trail (approximately 5 kms) on the east from the Old Wimpole Road past the Home Farm and back down beside Oddy Doddy Lane which would have less serious impact on the heart of the most significant central core of the historic landscape.

The Gardens Trust -The GT/CGT therefore still **OBJECT** to the above application.

Previous comments on original application stated: Wimpole is a very significant surviving historic parkland landscape not just locally but also nationally, and is a major example of the work of other important designers/architects (Bridgeman, Repton, Greening, Soane, James 'Athenian' Stuart & Emes) as well as Brown. In addition there are various cultural and heritage assets within the park. (D&A Statement 2.1.1) This cycle trail would affect three of the most important, key assets: the Hall itself, the Model Farm and the Gothic Tower. In terms of the education of future landscape/garden historians/landscape architects etc, the remarkable evidence (collection of plans/drawings, surviving historic assets) at Wimpole are probably the best in Cambridgeshire, and indeed amongst the top historic parks in the country, for understanding the rise and holistic development of 18C estates in particular. Should this application be permitted, visitors would no longer be able to 'read', appreciate or even understand Brown's original design. It is therefore extremely undesirable to impact in any way on the immediate setting of the

hall and the still existing historic landscape character out in the park, but most especially in the area around the south front of Wimpole Hall.

The NT wishes to install the cycle trail to attract yet more visitors to a venue, which with over 300,000 visitors annually, we would suggest, already approaches oversaturation.

Increased visitor numbers would add to problems of conservation and further impact on the fabric and management of the estate. The GT/CGT feel this could cause substantial additional harm particularly as the trail is intended to be clockwise (D & A.4.2) where this will, at times, be the busiest area. The GT/CGT do not agree that the effect of increased use on the local landscape character and the on the registered park as a whole is neutral. In particular this route for cyclists would have an additionally harmful impact on the commanding and stately main view south from the hall, (the major spatial 'WOW factor' experience), an aspect the Planning Design & Access Statement admits is already "well-trafficked" (D&A Statement 5.15). Additional cycle traffic would only add to a 'theme-park' feel.

Demonstrable health benefits already exist at Wimpole in terms of walking and riding.

Therefore we feel that the cycle trail with its stated "slightly adverse effect" around the edge of the Belts of (D&A Statement 5.13) should not be undertaken at all, since this is central to views in the heart of the park and could set a precedent for further degradation of the historic landscape character. In addition, occasional glimpsed views of cyclists especially to the west of the hill, the site of James Athenian Stuart's classical pavilion, and leading down to the Arrington Gates, and in front of the plantations making up Brown's belt north, would be out of keeping with the peaceful pastoral and rural nature of the park. This area of the cycle trail is one where visitors who climb the hill to where Stuart had his pavilion, can still admire the view east to the hall and the 2 mile avenue, and look south to the walnut avenue, the park trees and pasture, and west towards Arrington Gates.

If this trail is permitted, they will in future see an obtrusive, straight-ish, trail which does not marry with any other surface in the park and where cyclists will also distract and detract from the view. It would alter the impression of the wider estate and its seemingly unchanging 18c century ambience considerably, and make it no different from any modern public common or 20C/21C country park. Since the route of the cycle trail cannot run through the Wimpole Wood belt owing to its SSI designation, in our opinion the circuit scheme should be abandoned completely. A shorter, compromise circuit trail (approximately 5 kms) on the east from the Old Wimpole Road past the Home Farm and back down beside Oddy Doddy Lane would have less serious impact on the heart of the most significant central core of the historic landscape.

A wild-flower 'safety margin' of 12.5 metres along the north belt would impact on the view and textural nature of the landscape and not be in keeping with its historic design or use, and could become unkempt which would also not be in keeping with Brown's philosophy : "Keep all in view very neat". Since the park has already a rich bio-diversity, new measures for increased bio-diversity alongside the trail are unnecessary and, more importantly, detrimental to the aesthetic and cultural impact and the reading of the historic designed

landscape. Whilst we welcome plans to plant 1,000 new trees over the next 10 years, the plan to create 2.70 hectares (6.7 acres) of new woodland (D&A Statement 5.28 & 5.35) to mitigate the damage done by the trail could cause substantial harm to views and the design of the historic landscape.

We would like to conclude with a quote from Marchioness de Grey's famous letter : 'Mr Brown has been leading me such a Fairy Circle & his Magic Wand has raised such landscapes to the Eye – not visionary for they were all there but his Touch has brought them out with the same Effect as a Painter's Pencil upon Canvass...' 1 The magic of Wimpole is being able to walk out in the park and still experience the same 'fairy circles' as the original owners, exploring all the painterly views that were intended and indeed created. This same enchanting experience would disappear if inappropriate 21C bicycles were to dart across the scene along the straight, obtrusive trail - disturbing the eye, the distinctive historic character and the charm - let alone the increased necessary signage for safety purposes.

30. Local Highway Authority - The Highway Authority requests that the application be refused on the grounds of highway safety for the following reasons:

On drawing CTP 10.8 the proposed crossing of the multi-use trail crosses the Old Wimpole Road (AKA Orwell Road) mixes the most vulnerable highway users, i.e. pedestrians and cyclists with occasionally large numbers of motor vehicles. This would be to the detriment of highway safety. This request could be overcome if the route were redesigned to loop to the north of the main access and thus avoid any significant conflict with motor vehicle traffic.

Conditions recommended for levels and materials of track and an informative in relation to a requirement for separate permission from the Highway Authority for any works to the Highway.

Representations

31. Approximately 19no. representations have been received before and after the amended scheme. The comments incorporated the following summarised objections:

- The application proposes a multi-use trail which should be available for horse riders also.
- Other similar sites have trails of a similar nature where pedestrians, cycles and horses all successfully use trails.
- parking concerns- yellow lines have already pushed an existing problem further into Croydon
- no objection to the principle but have some detailed concerns
- The aesthetic effect of the track on the western end of the park will be considerable because of its hilly and very visible nature. It will create a scar on one of the most beautiful vistas in the park.
- the grant from Sport England is for "cycle tracks" and if this use is given priority it will be incompatible with other users
- more suitable location for the track would be in the flatter, eastern part of the park where there are less frequented areas
- The revised routing still incorporates a number of severe gradients which are not suitable for either wheelchair use or for the proposed mix of

pedestrian and cycle traffic where the speed of descending cyclists will negatively affect the safety of other trail users.

- Damage to the integrity of a listed property
- Damage to wildlife and landscape
- Safety concerns through conflict of incompatible users
- Detrimental effect on landscape created by Capability Brown
- Concerns that this will lead to payment to enter parklands
- concerns existing parking situation in Arrington will be exacerbated by those not wishing to pay for parking on the site.
- impact on the designed landscape
- negative impact on wildlife who will be disturbed by increased visitors into their habitats
- There is no information as to how the route would be managed to avoid conflict between users
- The re-routing to avoid the ecological impacts has created a greater landscape impact
- Bikes for hire on the site are not proposed which would allow more people to use the trail
- It will alter the countryside experience by introducing a formal path
- Will spoil peaceful and quiet enjoyment of countryside by encouraging increased activity
- There is a discrepancy in the plans
- Comparison to other National Trust sites is not fair as this site is Grade 1 Listed and the comparison sites are Grade II which illustrates the importance of Wimpole Hall and that it should be afforded greater protection
- Harm to Heritage assets outside of the site-the Alms Houses in Arrington

The following support has also been received:

:

- I support the application for this trail; if it allows more people to enjoy the whole estate then that will be a major plus. I come to the estate regularly and would be delighted to see more people relishing the further corners of the estate which may be inaccessible to them at the moment.
- this will increase the accessibility of the site which is supported

Planning Assessment

32. The key considerations in determining this application are;

- Principle of development
- Impact on setting of the Listed Building, Park and Gardens
- Character and Appearance of the Area
- Ecology and Wildlife
- Highways and transport

Principle of the Development

33. The proposal is to construct a 8.54km long multi-use trail with associated signage and gating along the route which will provide improved wayfinding and encourage use of the wider parkland and estate landscape. The new build sections of the MUT will be 2.5m–3m wide., with existing estate access road widths maintained. Located within Wimpole Park the trail will be constructed using methods tailored according to the nature of the existing paths being improved, ground conditions present, and proximity of tree roots. As detailed

in the Design and Access statement the proposed trail would provide and improve access for walkers, cyclists and those with limited mobility to all parkland attractions.

34. Policy S/1 seeks to ensure that the District will continue to be the best place to live, work and study in the country and that our District will support economic growth. Policy S/2 advises that this will be secured through key objectives which include:
 - (a) "To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's positions as a world leader in.... education; and supporting the rural economy and
 - (e) To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone"
35. Policy E/19 (Tourist Facilities and Visitors Attractions) states that:
"Proposals for new or extended tourist facilities and visitor attractions (excluding accommodation) in the countryside will be supported where it can be demonstrated that:
 - a. The development utilises and enhances the areas existing tourism assets;
 - c. There would be no significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area;
 - d. The scheme is in scale with its location and the nature if the facility it supports
 - e. The proposal maximises sustainable travel opportunities, including walking, cycling, horse-riding and public transport. Proposal which would have a significant adverse impact in terms of the amount of nature of traffic generated will be refused;"
36. In the supporting text for Policy E/19 it states:
"The NPPF requires support for sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside. The policy is intended to support the districts existing attractions and assets."
37. The proposed development is an extension to the existing facilities and trails at the Wimpole Estate and in accordance with the above Policies the principle of such a development is acceptable. The impact in terms of character, highways and biodiversity is set out below.
38. **Impact to the setting of the Listed Building, Parks and Gardens**
Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to pay "special regard to the desirability of preserving the (listed) building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."
39. Recent planning case law has confirmed that having "special regard" to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building under section 66 involves more than merely giving weight to those matters in the planning balance. In particular, case law has confirmed that "preserving" in the context of Listed Buildings means doing no harm.
40. Paragraph 193 of the NPPF, in the section dealing with the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, states that "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated

heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.”.

41. Paragraph 195 of the NPPF states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm or to a total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.
42. Paragraph 196 of the NPPF says that “Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use”.
43. As detailed in the consultation response from Historic England, the Wimpole estate is considered to be a complex, multi-layered historic designed landscape comprising an extensive landscape park first enclosed in the 13th century and developed extensively from the mid-17th century, focussed on substantial neoclassical Wimpole Hall set within 19th century formal gardens developed on the site of a previous later 17th century garden alongside mid-18th century to 19th century pleasure grounds. As detailed in the same response and from representations the grounds display clear evidence of the involvement of multiple notable landscape designers including Charles Bridgeman, Robert Greening, Lancelot Brown, William Emes and Humphry Repton.
44. The consultation response from Historic England confirmed, alongside the separate response received from the Heritage Officer, that there were no objections to the proposal. The comments have concluded that the proposal would not have a material impact on the visual character of the park or the setting of designated heritage assets.
45. Further concerns have been raised in relation to the potential impact of the proposal on Listed Buildings outside of the application site at Arrington. Officers do not consider that these properties will be affected by the proposals as a result of the distance from the properties to the proposed trail which will be significantly separated by established boundary trees and hedging.
46. Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposal is not considered to damage the setting of any heritage assets and the relationship of the development on the site and their significance would remain preserved. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Policy NH/14 of the adopted Local Plan.

Character and Appearance of the local area

47. Policy HQ/1 of the LDF states that all new developments should preserve or enhance the character of the local area and be compatible with its location and appropriate in terms of scale, mass, form, siting, design, proportions and materials.
48. A number of concerns have been raised in the representations regarding the impact of the proposals on the landscape and character of the area, which is occupied in large part by the estate.

49. The application site forms part of the wider Wimpole estate facilities, and would formalise and improve the existing network of paths. To deliver the proposed trail a number of individual trees will be removed details of which have been included in a number of tree reports. The trees Officer have considered the reports submitted and are satisfied with the details. The Tree Survey (ref CTP.10.2d), Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Tree Protection Plan (dated 15th August 2018) and Arboricultural Method Statement (dated 15th August 2018) appear to relate to the Bat Survey Report (Trees) (version 16.08.18) are all intended to be attached as approved documents should the application be approved.
50. The formalisation of the trail and the installation of the signage and associated furniture, for example gates and finger posts, will result in a visual change to the existing character of the park and woodland, however the use of sympathetic detailing and surfacing will help reduce the visual impact of the formalisation. Additionally, the visual dominance of the trial on the landscape and character is likely to soften in the future, as it begins to merge with the surrounding vegetation. Given the above mentioned points it is considered that the proposal adheres to policy HQ/1 in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and landscape.

Ecology and Wildlife

51. Policy NH/4 (Biodiversity) and Policy NH/5 (Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance) relate to this scheme. The application site contains multiple habitats. The proposed trail lies adjacent and within the Eversden and Wimpole Woods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which is designated for its breeding colony of Barbastelle bats and associated woodland, it will require a statutory consultation with Natural England prior to the determination of the application. The proposed trail also lies within and adjacent to the Wimpole Park County Wildlife Site (CWS) which has been designated for being a Grade C site in the JNCC Invertebrate Site Register. There are multiple species records from the site including multiple species of bats, great crested newts, important invertebrates, birds, and small and large mammals.
52. A number of concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the proposals on the wildlife in the area that may be affected both through the construction of the trail and also by the increased levels of visitors that the trail is likely to have.
53. During the application process minor amendments to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Ecological Impact Assessments; Part 1 & 2 were submitted, in addition to a Bat Survey Report (Trees) (Ecoconsult, August 2018).
54. The reports provide evidence of several trees which have high, medium, and low bat roosting suitability but which presently contain no bat roosts. These trees are to be removed or manged in one form or another. The reports have provided a mitigation strategy for these trees which consultees have recommended should be conditioned as part of any decision notice should the application be recommended for approval.
55. Additional mitigation regarding other protected species (great crested newts, badgers, and reptiles for example) and habitat protection is located in the Ecological Impact Assessments; Part 1 & 2. The consultee has advised that

these strategies appear to be sound and again recommends conditioning them within any decision notice issued.

56. A mitigation strategy is currently distributed between three documents. Officers consider that this strategy should be complied into a single document and discharged through conditioning a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP). A condition to this effect is therefore recommended for attachment should approval be recommended.
57. Officers have considered the proposed condition from the Environment Agency and consider that it would be reasonable for attachment should approval.
58. Given the design of the scheme, mitigation measures, and the use of conditions it is considered that the proposal adheres to policies NH/4 and NH/5 in terms of its impact on the Ecology and Wildlife which is important to the area.

Highway Safety

59. A number of concerns have been raised by the Parish and local residents in respect of the potential impact of the scheme on highway safety and parking.
60. Policy HQ/1 of the adopted Local Plan seeks to ensure that proposals either maintain or enhance the safety of the highway network. The NPPF also seeks to ensure that proposals do not result in any adverse impact on the safety of highway users.
61. The majority of the MUT will be located on private land within the estate with the exception of two proposed road crossings at Old Wimpole Road at the existing vehicle entrance to Wimpole Hall and Oddy Doddy Lane to the south of 'The Belts' woodland.
62. The Local Highway Authority has raised an objection in relation to the crossing at the current main entrance to the site. This has been further considered upon advice that the current entrance will be closed to the public upon completion of the new car park works. Officers have therefore been able to agree a condition that satisfies the Local Highway Authority that requires the permanent closure of the existing entrance to motor vehicles to members of the public which will remove the conflict concerns raised and the objection from the Local Highway Authority.
63. Further concerns have been raised in relation to parking issues. The applicant has confirmed that the new car park at Wimpole is about to start construction and is set to be completed in Autumn 2019. This new car park will solve the current problem of inadequate and poor quality parking on site, which impacts on local roads in terms of queues and inappropriate parking. Wimpole is creating 700 surfaced all-weather parking spaces for cars to park quickly and easily, as well as provision for coaches and overflow capacity for peak days. Wimpole is also planning to simplify its estate ticketing, and as part of this Wimpole have decided that the new car park will not retain the current £2 per day parking charge, and instead will be free to park for all visitors.

64. In addition to the new car park the applicant has confirmed that it acknowledges that there are perceived parking issues in Arrington Village, largely at the weekends. To acknowledge this perceived issue, the applicant has offered a Unilateral Undertaking to fund a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) consultation exercise to see whether local residents in Arrington would want parking restrictions in the form of yellow lining. The TRO process would nonetheless be undertaken by the local highway authority.
65. Should the TRO consultation exercise show that residents do want parking restrictions, National Trust would fund the implementation of the yellow lining and appropriate signage. However, this would be capped at an agreed figure. Whilst the Unilateral Undertaking would be part of any planning decision, the timing for implementation and/or subsequent works (if required) will not be tied to the implementation of the permission (i.e. such as a requirement to complete any consultation or required yellow lining works before the new trail can be brought into use, for example).
66. As a result of the above, officers are satisfied that the proposals will not have any adverse impact on highway safety in accordance with policy HQ/1.

Other Matters

67. Representations have raised issue that the multi-use trail which should be available for horse riders also. There are no details contained within the application that would prevent the use of the trail by certain users.
68. Representations have commented that there are more suitable routes for the track within the application site. The application is only able to consider the proposals as submitted however.
69. Safety concerns and queries as to how the route would be managed to avoid conflict between users have been raised. The proposals include signage and advice notices which are designed to help users along the route.
70. Concerns that this will lead to payment to enter parklands and proposals that the park should provide bikes for hire within the site are not matters than can be given weight in the considerations of this application.

Recommendation

71. Officers recommend delegated approval subject to:

Requirements under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

72. Completion of a Unilateral Undertaking in respect of the funding of a TRO.

Conditions

73. Planning conditions as set out below, with the final wording of any amendments to these to be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair prior to the issuing of planning permission:

- (a) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
(Reason - To ensure that consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development, which have not been acted upon).
- (b) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: EclA Part 1 (20th August 2018), EclA Part 2 (20th August 2018), Bat Survey Report (Trees) (August 2018), Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Tree Protection Plan (15th August 2018), Arboricultural Method Statement (15th August 2018), Drawing CTP.10.1f (Multi-Use Trail & Designations), Drawing CTP.10.2d (Tree Survey), Drawing CTP.10.3e (Signage, Gates & Fences Layout), Drawing CTP.10.8a (Public Road Crossings – Main Drive & Oddy Doddy Lane), Drawing CTP.10.9a (Development Site Boundary), Drawing CTP.10.9a (Development Site Boundary), Drawing CTP10.5a (Generic Construction Details).
(Reason - To facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
- (c) No development shall take place until a plan for the protection of and/or mitigation of damage to the watercourse, both during construction works and once the trail is complete, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the following elements:
-how the watercourse crossings are assessed for potential impacts on ecology from the proposals
-how the watercourse would be protected during any construction works
-the potential impacts on any water voles, fish, eels or other protected or aquatic species
-ecological enhancements that can be made at the locations
-replacement of culverts with clear span bridges should be considered.
Works shall then proceed in accordance with the approved plan.
(Reason: Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework recognises that the planning system should aim to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity.)
- (d) No part of the multi use trail hereby approved shall be brought into use until a scheme of soft landscaping including new woodland and wildflower grassland creation to compensate for the loss of both trees and grassland has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed details shall then be implemented in the next available planting season.
(Reason - To ensure the development is satisfactorily assimilated into the area and enhances biodiversity in accordance with Policies HQ/1 and NH/4 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
- (e) The development hereby approved shall take place in full accordance with approved mitigation and monitoring proposals as detailed in the Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) Part 2.
(Reason - To minimise disturbance, harm or potential impact upon protected species in accordance with Policies S/3, HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and their protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981).

(f) No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEcMP shall include the following:

- A) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
- B) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
- C) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
- D) The location and timings of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- E) The times during which construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- F) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- G) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- H) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs if applicable.

The approved CEcMP shall be ahead to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

(Reason - To minimise disturbance, harm or potential impact upon protected species in accordance with Policies S/3, HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and their protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981).

(g) Prior to the commencement of the development, a badger survey shall be carried out within the site by a suitably qualified ecologist. A report of the findings including a suitable mitigation strategy if required, should badger be found, shall be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To minimise disturbance, harm or potential impact upon protected species in accordance with Policies S/3, HQ/1 and NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 and their protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981).

(h) The multi use trail hereby approved shall not come in to operation prior to the permanent closing of the existing main access drive, to all motor vehicle traffic other than those employed by the National Trust or any successor.

(Reason: To ensure that the proposed crossing at Old Wimpole Road does not cause detriment to highway safety in accordance with HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018)

(i) The proposed trail hereby approved shall be constructed so that its falls and levels are such that no private water from the site drains across or onto the adopted public highway and shall be constructed using a bound material for at least 5m from the boundary of the adopted public highway along the trail to prevent debris spreading onto the adopted public highway.

(Reason - In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018).

Background Papers:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
 - South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework SPDs
 - Planning File reference S/1486/18/FL

Report Author: Alison Twyford Senior Planning Officer
Telephone Number 01954 713264